DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 226 RC 013 526

AUTHOR Chevalier, Zelda W.; And Others.
TITLE Responsive Evaluation of an Indian Heritage Studies Program: Analyzing Boundary Definition in a Suburban School Context.
PUB DATE 22 Mar 82
NOTE 94p.; Paper presented at the Annual American Educational Research Association Meeting (New York City, NY, March 22, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indian Culture; *American Indian Education; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Background; Ethnic Stereotypes; *Interaction Process Analysis; Intergroup Relations; *Parent Participation; Parent Teacher Cooperation; *Teacher Participation; *Urban American Indians

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a pilot project in curriculum integration, funded by the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program, and is intended to explore ways of coordinating public school instruction with Indian heritage education. Classroom teachers in a suburban school district participated in six workshops with Indian parents, students, and heritage instructors in area Title IVA and Title VII programs. Contact theory was used to design a series of structured, cooperative activities. These included: goal-setting for multi-cultural education, evaluating instructional resources, integrating content areas, training in cooperative learning strategies, and improving home-school communications through critical incident scenarios. Consultants presenting included traditionalist elders. Workshop activities are described and demonstrated, and results to date from responsive evaluation interviews are reported. It is proposed that the workshop design may have applications elsewhere, particularly in urban and suburban districts with Title IVA or other heritage programs. (AUTHOR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220226

Responsive Evaluation of an Indian Heritage Studies Program: Analyzing Boundary Definition in a Suburban School Context

Zelda W. Chevalier, Ed.D.
Department of Elementary & Secondary Education & Reading
State University College
Geneseo, New York

Sue Roark-Calnek, Ph.D.
Department of Anthropology
State University College
Geneseo, New York

David B. Strahan, Ed.D.
Department of Elementary & Secondary Education & Reading
State University College
Geneseo, New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Zelda W. Chevalier
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Education Research Association
Annual Meeting
New York City
March 22, 1982

RC 013526

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ABSTRACT

RESPONSIVE EVALUATION OF AN INDIAN HERITAGE STUDIES PROGRAM: ANALYZING BOUNDARY DEFINITION IN A SUBURBAN SCHOOL CONTEXT

This paper reports on a pilot project in curriculum integration, funded by the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program, and is intended to explore ways of coordinating public school instruction with Indian heritage education. Classroom teachers in a suburban school district participated in six workshops with Indian parents, students, and heritage instructors in area Title IVA and Title VII programs. Contact theory was used to design a series of structured, cooperative activities. These included: goal-setting for multi-cultural education, evaluating instructional resources, integrating content areas, training in cooperative learning strategies, and improving home-school communications through "critical incident" scenarios. Consultants presenting included traditionalist elders. Workshop activities are described and demonstrated, and results to date from responsive evaluation interviews are reported. It is proposed that the workshop design may have applications elsewhere, particularly in urban and suburban districts with Title IVA or other heritage programs.

Submitted by

Zelda W. Chevalier, Ed.D.

Sue Roark-Calnek, Ph.D.

David B. Strahan, Ed.D.

SUNY Geneseo

SEP 1982
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

I

OVERVIEW

During 1979-1980 a needs assessment was conducted by a Native American heritage education program, funded through Title IVA of the Indian Education Act (P. L. 92-318), in a suburban school district. Results indicated that the cultural achievements and historical experience of Native Americans were not being given sufficient or accurate emphasis by classroom teachers. Moreover, when discussions of Indian heritage did occur in schools, Indian parents and children often felt unable either to express their concerns openly or to contribute information.

In response to these findings, an interdisciplinary Ethnic Heritage Studies pilot project (U. S. Department of Education Grant #C-008004471) was designed to improve articulation between Indian heritage education and public school instruction and to reduce the dissonance between the Native American suburban community and the schools. To that end, a series of six workshops were planned to bring interested parties together, pre- and inservice teachers, local Indian paraprofessionals, and youth. The format for the intervention was informed by Allport's (1954) contact theory and subsequent elaborations (Cook, 1969).

The purpose of the study reported here is to describe the effects of the content and method of that inservice program on its participants within the context of a naturalistic responsive evaluation model (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). In contrast with preordinate types of evaluation, the naturalistic responsive evaluation framework emphasizes continuous evaluation and the systematic inclusion of the concerns of the participants into the project design.

Issues and concerns emerging during the recruitment phase of the project continued to receive expression in verbal and nonverbal behaviors in the workshops, in response to the structure of interactions imposed by the project design and in turn, through responsive input by participants, leading to certain modifications of that design. These concerns were subsequently explored more fully with participants in follow-through interviews.

The analytical framework of symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969; Kimmel, 1980) was employed by investigators to interpret participants' responses as evidencing processes of identity negotiation, through which actors sought to define and redefine ethnic and professional status boundaries and moved from role taking to role making. These processes were particularly crucial for Indian participants, who grappled with sometimes conflicting concerns to present themselves as distinctive individuals and at the same time as members of an ethnic collectivity. The negotiation of identity within and across social boundaries contributed in turn to a convergence in perceptions between Indian and non-Indian participants, documented in the follow-through interviews.

The organization of this report is as follows: Section II describes the rationale for the selection of the methodological and conceptual frameworks used to analyze and interpret the data. Section III will provide the reader with information about the background of the participants in the project and highlight the demographic variables salient for understanding the thematic processes listed above. Section IV will describe the workshop design, with emphasis on the elements and events critical for these processes. The results from analysis of the observational and interview data are reported in Section V. The final section (VI) summarizes the conclusions, the generalizability

of the project, and its potential for applications elsewhere. Suggestions are made for modifications in the project design. Appendix A, drawn from the project's final report to the U. S. Department of Education, describes continuing initiatives by workshop participants in pursuit of project goals.

II

METHODOLOGICAL/CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Research Framework

The research framework for this investigation emerged from the process of evaluating the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program workshops. In order to assess the effectiveness of the program in meeting its objectives, evaluation procedures were designed and implemented at the beginning of the project. Information gathered in this evaluation process became the data for this investigation. A principal evaluation consultant was hired and began working with the directors during the fall months of 1980 to help formulate a naturalistic framework for evaluation.

Rationale for evaluation. Naturalistic responsive evaluation (Guba and Lincoln, 1981) was chosen as a basis for evaluation procedure. This approach utilizes naturalistic inquiry, recording "slice-of-life episodes documented through natural language and representing as closely as possible how people feel ((and)) what they know" (Wolf and Tymitz, 1976-1977:6). Guba and Lincoln elaborated the definition of naturalistic inquiry to include those investigations that impose very few constraints on the antecedent variables and possible outcomes of that which is investigated. Thus, principal sources of information should be natural and unobtrusive: participant observation, interviewing, and analysis of documents.

In addition, Guba and Lincoln incorporated elements of responsive evaluation. As defined by Stake (1975), this is an evaluation mode that "orients more directly to program activities than to program intents; responds to audience requirements for information; and ((refers to))...the different value

perspectives present...in reporting the sucess and failure of the program" (p. 14).

Thus, naturalistic responsive evaluation emphasizes varied and open-ended procedures, continuous monitoring, and feedback to relevant audiences, eliciting and addressing issues of concern to them. It was felt that this approach was particularly appropriate for the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program, given the interdisciplinary nature of the workshop staff and evaluation team (educators and anthropologists), the origins of the project in community initiatives, and the interest of staff and potential participants in applications to the educational and social context of the intervention. Moreover, the approach was seen to be sufficiently flexible to allow for monitoring and modification of the evaluation process itself, as investigators looked for effective and informative ways to assess the extent to which complex and not easily measurable objectives, including increased awareness and increased effective communication, were being met.

As described in Section IV, the workshop design was informed by elements of contact theory (Allport, 1954; Cook, 1969). The intent of the designers was neither a formal test of contact theory nor an experimental manipulation of its variables. A non-experimental, non-quantitative approach was suggested by a number of considerations: the urgency of resolving pragmatic issues in program articulation, the difficulties in establishing adequate controls between such widely diversified ethnic and professional groups, and the complexities of integrating content and process in workshops extending over a five month period. Instead, the designers elected to employ contact theory as a framework which would elicit a flow of interpersonal events that could best

be captured by qualitative evaluation following the naturalistic responsive evaluation model.

It was expected that contact theory would also provide a set of guidelines for monitoring the formative decision processes demanded by responsive evaluation. This reciprocal arrangement would thus serve as a safeguard for the designers against judgements that, in the rush of events, might be based on opportunistic or political considerations.

Evaluation Procedures

Data sources. Two principal types of data, observational reports and interview responses, were gathered. Over a period of five months, field notes recorded by the observation team were analyzed for information about processes occurring during the workshops themselves. Concerns generated in this analysis formed a list of issues to be explored in interviews with participants during the three month period following the final workshop. Researchers designed an evaluation interview protocol with questions grouped in five clusters with follow-up options listed for interviews (see Appendix A). Using this protocol, interviews with 31 participants were conducted by the three investigators; all responses were transcribed for analysis. One of the researchers also served as participant observer for continuing description of activities by participants in the semester following the workshops.

Participant observer. Two college students volunteered to assist in gathering data. They were assisted from time to time by other student volunteers. These students, along with the principal evaluator and the workshop directors, formed the observation team. During all planning and workshop sessions, evaluators functioned as participant observers, recording field notes and discussing events with participants in an unobtrusive fashion. After each

workshop session, the observation team met with the directors to report information gathered. Evaluation was thus responsive, intended to clarify concerns of all stakeholders in the project and formative, intended to assist in planning workshop events.

The results of the analysis of all data gathered in the observational reports of workshop events, interviews with participants, and continued participant observation are reported in Section V.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework employed for data analysis was itself an emergent, developing as researchers sought to arrange these data in intelligible form and to understand their implications for the concerns of the stakeholders involved. As in the process of data gathering, the research team drew on models from cultural anthropology, but integrated these models with work in the symbolic interactionism and social attitude paradigms of sociology and social psychology.

Ethnographic research has produced a number of perceptive, naturalistic studies of Indian education in community settings (cf. Wax, Wax, & Dumont, 1964; Wolcott, 1969; Phillips, 1972; Sindell, 1974). For the most part, these studies have been conducted in rural or reservation communities where some degree of "traditionalist" cultural consensus can be discerned and its reflections traced in the classroom behavior of Indian children. Emphasis is given to discontinuities between traditional, informal modes of education and formal schooling, with the latter appearing as an intrusive instrument of acculturation "the teacher as enemy" (Wolcott, 1974).

Analyses of culture contrast and conflict, however persuasive for traditional communities, shed insufficient light on the educational experience of

Indian children and their parents, and were found to leave much unexplained about the workshop dynamics here reported. In order to understand these dynamics, investigators turned to recent work in the anthropology of ethnicity and in symbolic interactionism.

Bennett (1975, p. 4) has reviewed the shift in anthropology from what he calls a "culture-population-group" frame of reference to a "cognitive and behavioral-strategy frame which views ethnicity as a component of social participation." In this latter perspective, the questions to ask are how people classify themselves and others, and what instrumental or expressive functions are served by acting out ethnic identity (see Blu, 1980 for a recent application to contemporary Indian ethnicity). This "new ethnicity" can accommodate ethnic identification that is situationally relative and varying in the salience that it has for individual actors. The seminal work in this area has been Fredrik Barth's (1969) analysis of ethnic boundaries as defined by the extent to which interaction within or between ethnic groups is structured by the selective display and equally selective perception of boundary-marking, emblematic cultural forms.

The heuristic metaphors of symbolic interactionism help make sense of this presentation of individual and collective selves within and across ethnic boundaries. As defined by Blumer (1969), Kimmel (1980), and others, symbolic interactionism is a way of understanding interaction as the process by which we construct the meanings we attach to social objects. Principal among these social objects is our own role identity, "the character and role that an individual devises for himself as the occupant of a particular social position" (McCall & Simmons, 1966, p. 67). As actors exchange information about roles,

interaction becomes a "negotiation of identities" (Brittan, 1973, pp. 147-148; Goffman, 1959, 1963). This process has been variously understood as role taking, an internalization of the perceived role expectations of others, or as a more active and creative role-making (Meltzer & Petras, 1972), a carving out of identities from interactional space.

A symbolic interactionist perspective requires that the context of interaction be described as the actors themselves define and experience it and that their interactions be understood for what they show about the boundaries people draw between self and others. This study reports on two linked social contexts: an Indian community in a suburban school district and a workshop "stage" introduced into that community by the Ethnic Heritage Studies in-service program. The interplay between these two contexts is described as that interplay reflected and reshaped boundaries drawn between Indians and non-Indians, families and teachers.

III

CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

School and Community Characteristics

The school district is located in the northeastern United States, in a metropolitan area with a population of approximately 800,000. The community is broadly representative of suburban-exurban areas; highly dense residential tracts are intermixed with undeveloped or agricultural land. Most industries are concentrated in one quadrant of the community.

In 1981, opening school enrollment totalled 6,738 students. Approximately one-third of that number were enrolled in the district's five elementary schools. The remainder were distributed between two junior and two senior high schools. The school-age population reflects demographic changes not uncommon in other northeastern suburban districts on the borders of central cities: high mobility, recently declining enrollments in the elementary grades, and an increase in the percentage of minority students (from 2.70% in 1970 to over 10% in 1981).

These changes, and rising program costs, pose challenges for school administrators. However, the district has continued to provide the community with innovative auxiliary education services, supported by numerous inservice education programs for teachers who receive an hourly stipend for attendance. Salary adjustments are made for teachers who enroll in courses outside the district. In recent years, the district has become strongly committed to developing multicultural education, in response to the growing number (and diversity) of ethnic minorities. Support for the Title IVA heritage program serving children from the Native American community should be viewed in this context.

Characteristics of Native Americans

Indians are a small and not easily enumerated fraction of the metropolitan area's ethnically heterogeneous population. Preliminary data from the 1980 census show 1,657 (out of 702,238) in the county as a whole, with 1,014 (of 214,741) in the center city (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Advance Reports, 1980 Census of Population and Housing, PHC80-V-34).

These data almost certainly underrepresent the actual number of persons of Indian descent. In the suburban school district studied, only 95 persons of all ages were counted as Indian in the two townships within the district's boundaries; in contrast the LEA has identified from 146 (in 1979) to 101 (1982) children of school age alone as eligible for enrollment in the district's Title IVA program. A comparison of census returns for county subdivisions with BEDS data reported in 1980 by city and suburban schools (which show a much greater range between the same subdivisions) indicates that, except in the three districts where Indian heritage programs coordinate data reporting with central administrations, the undercounting of Indian children in schools is particularly marked.

Examined with these qualifications in mind, census data and school enrollments suggest that Indian families are widely and thinly dispersed throughout the metropolitan area. In the center city, 243 identified Indian children are enrolled in 40 of the city's 52 schools. In the suburban district studied, all nine schools have Indian students, but no more than ten are enrolled at any one elementary school.

Equally striking, and even more significant for the study we report, is the diversity of the Native American population. Families differ widely in

their geographic and cultural origins and in the extent to which connection or identification with other Indian communities is maintained. Within the same household, individuals of Indian descent may also vary in the extent to which they are visibly different from their non-Indian neighbors and classmates and in their eligibility for tribal, state and federal Indian programs.

The majority, particularly in the center city, are Iroquois, with Mohawks as the most numerous. They range from recent migrants from upstate and Canadian reservations to families who have been urban for three generations or more. The area's exceptional opportunities for employment and higher education, particularly in professional and high-technology fields, have also attracted Indian people from as far away as California, the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. No fewer than 19 tribal identifications, including Tlingit, Navaho, Sioux, Choctaw and Chippewa, are represented among the 101 children in the suburban school district studied.

The suburban Indian population appears to differ from that of the center city in some other respects. Household composition data and partial genealogies for twelve families participating in the study or otherwise active in the Title IVA program, together with interviews with Title IVA staff regarding other families in the district, indicate that a majority of the households identified as "Indian" also contain a non-Indian parent or step-parent/spouse; this high rate of inter-marriage contributes to the low visibility of Indians in the schools and community.

Families in the suburb are relatively young (although, as is true for the district as a whole, the age profile of school children has been shifting upward in recent years). Like their non-Indian neighbors, they tend to be geographically

and socially mobile; this is reflected in turnover in Title IVA enrollments, Parent Committee membership, and staff. Income data are lacking, but occupational and housing data for the families cited above together with anecdotal reporting on other families in the program suggest that in socioeconomic profile Indians in the suburb are representative of the population at large. In where they live and what they do for a living, they range from working class to upper middle class, with some concentration in white collar and service occupations. Most have completed high school and aspire to higher education for their children or themselves; two families have parents currently enrolled in local graduate and professional programs.

The context and characteristics of this Indian population would seem to be highly conducive to social and cultural assimilation. Given their not infrequent mobility (even transience) and dispersal, Indian ethnicity lacks social grounding in the customary relations of "kith and kin"--interpersonal networks of neighborhood and kinship ties--reported for reservation communities by Wax (1971) and others, and traceable in adjustments to primary urbanization as well (Price, 1978, pp. 147-169).

With the low visibility conferred by inter-marriage, economic and neighborhood integration, ethnicity becomes optional if not wholly a matter of private definition, contingent upon the decision to present oneself as "Indian" to others in certain situations. As a corollary, there may appear a wide range of behavioral and attitudinal commitments to Indianness, corresponding only in part to the "acculturation continuum" (Spindler, 1955) of adjustments to the dominant culture.

In his seminal work on ethnic boundaries, Barth (1969) argued that members

of ethnic minorities in contemporary integrated complex society have three alternatives:

> . . . (i.) they may attempt to pass and become incorporated in the . . . industrial society and (dominant) cultural group; (ii.) they may accept a 'minority' status, accommodate to and seek to reduce their minority disabilities by encapsulating all cultural differentiae in sectors of non-articulation while participating in the larger system of the (dominant) group in the other sectors of activity; (iii) they may choose to emphasize ethnic identity, using it to develop new positions and patterns to organize activities in these sectors formerly not found in their society (p. 33).

If the second alternative is chosen, intergroup interaction will not "spring from the complementarity of ethnic identities (but will take place) entirely within the framework of the dominant, majority group's statuses and institutions, where identity as a minority member gives no basis for action (Barth, 1969, p. 31). In other words, Indian identity will be <u>formally</u> irrelevant, although it may, <u>informally</u>, be greeted with stereotyping, negatively stigmatic or positively romantic in nature.

By "encapsulating . . . cultural differentiae" Barth means that the display of cultural forms as symbols or emblems of ethnic identity is generally confined to situations where members of the ethnic group interact with each other and not with members of other groups. Such intermittent displays can have important expressive functions (DeVos & Romanucci-Ross, 1975) for the individual who seeks to reconcile an often deeply, if privately, felt

interest in ethnic heritage with the role demands of neighborhood, workplace and school. They can also, even in the absence of "kith and kin" ties, serve as a locus of ethnic community and social support.

Since 1975 the principal arena for the emblematic display and social reinforcement of Indian ethnicity has been a K-12 Title IVA heritage education program. The program was originally organized at the initiative of the district. A woman who attended the first meeting recalls that, "We didn't know most of the people there. We said, 'Are you Indian too?'" Since its inception, it has been staffed mainly by Indian paraprofessionals (for whom positions in the program have been an identity-reinforcing occupational niche). They are responsible to a Parent Committee working in concert with a non-Indian school administrator as Project Director and LEA representative.

Weekly heritage classes (for grades K-2, 3-6 and 7-12) are held in a Resource Room in a centrally located elementary school to which children are bussed after school. A small satellite program for children in a suburb northwest of the center city is conducted through a consortium with that suburb's school district. Elsewhere in the metropolitan area only the center city itself has Indian heritage programs: a Title IVA after-school program in the city's Native American Cultural Center on the east side and a Title VII Mohawk Bilingual/Bicultural Program serving public and parochial students in three schools on the city's west side.

In the suburb, program goals and objectives were derived by the Parent Committee and staff from needs assessment surveys of district Indian parents, youth, and classroom teachers, the most recent in March 1980. Four goal areas, instructive in the range of cultural adjustments they encompass, were identified:

1. to strengthen Native American student ethnic identity through the study of Native American culture and history and participation in Native American cultural life;

2. to increase awareness of current events and contemporary issues affecting Native American people;

3. to improve student career awareness and knowledge of information or post-secondary education institutions, financial assistance, and application processes;

4. to provide Native American students and parents with knowledge of and direct assistance in dealing with the school district's policies and practices in relation to special academic needs of Indian students.

The Parent Committee and staff define the program's responsibilities in the latter two goal areas as informational and referral only. In contrast with many other Title IVA programs, no tutoring or other direct remedial services have been provided, in part, because no pattern of significant differences in grade-level performance between Indian and non-Indian children in this district has been established.

Interim and year-end evaluations by independent consultants have consistently shown more documentation for meeting objectives in the first goal area, that of strengthening identity by cultural instruction and experience, than for any other goal area. This is congruent with the emphasis given in interviews with parents and staff to, as one parent put it, "Teaching our kids about their culture; where else are they going to learn it?"

In contrast to the Iroquois curricula taught in the city programs, cultural instruction in the suburb is designed to acquaint children with the full

range of traditional cultures represented in the ancestry of district families. Each year three culture areas, with representative tribal groups, are selected for study. Instruction is project-oriented, with priority given to the completion of emblematic forms--artwork and crafts--for display, in the Resource Room and, in the form of regalia, at area Indian public gatherings. Field trips to such gatherings are occasionally organized for students and parents, usually through the initiative of one staff person who is more active than most in regional Indian organizations and concerns. In addition to their cultural significance, these gatherings not infrequently address current social and political issues like land claims and contemporary reservation factional disputes, concerning which there has been some dissensus within the program.

Field trips and monthly "Family Nights," with traditionalist elders from nearby reservation communities and other Indian resource persons as speakers, are principally attended by seven core families, all of whom have one or more members on the Parent Committee. For these families in particular, the program has become a focus of sociality and network recruitment for mutual aid in times of need. Members of these families vary as widely in cultural and geographic background as does the district's Indian population at large, but more have post-secondary education than is apparently the norm, and all but one have members employed in or in training for skilled-technology or professional fields. In four of the seven families, both spouses have at least some Indian ancestry, providing support for their high level of activity in the program.

Beyond these core families, participation in the program varies widely, with enrollment in heritage classes ranging from one-third to somewhat under one-half of the district's counted students attending the three after-school

classes. The level of participation is significantly higher for elementary than for secondary students. All Indian families in the district are reached by the program's newsletter, which reports on program activities, presents symbolic cultural vignettes and graphics, and publicizes area Indian events. Staff logs indicate that non-attending children and their parents often make use of the project's informational resources.

The district count has itself varied widely, as much in response to changes in federal guidelines for certifying children as eligibly "Indian" as to the demographics of aging and cross-district mobility. Between 1979 and 1982, a substantial reduction in the count, from 146 to 101, was necessary. In addition to its impact on the level of funding, this reduction focused attention very sharply on the discrepancy between what might be called jural Indianness, defined as eligibility under tribal, state or federal law for benefits or programs, and ethnic Indianness, in the sense of at least limited self-identification and acceptance by others in the community. Assistance is offered to persons attempting to trace and document Indian ancestry; since the program's inception, a score or more persons have sought such assistance (not always with a successful outcome).

In a number of other respects, the Title IVA program has functioned to focus and define awareness of interethnic boundaries in educational terms. Preliminary inquiry elicited perceptions of dissonance as well as complementarity between the content and process of heritage instruction, on the one hand, and, on the other, what goes on in mainstream classrooms. Thus, while the Title IVA program was seen as a complementary, identity-reinforcing cultural experience for Indian children, concerns were expressed regarding the

mixed, contradictory messages that children and their parents were receiving. Among these concerns was the inadequacy and inaccuracy of resources for teaching about Indian culture and history in mainstream classrooms, with textbooks singled out for particular criticism. In addition, status hierarchies in schools were reported as barriers to communication between Indian paraprofessionals and credentialed professional teachers, as well as between teachers, children and parents.

Of particular significance were concerns reflecting the low visibility of Indian children in mainstream classrooms, and the extent to which boundary definition is a matter of control over information. Many children participating in the Title IVA program, and most who do not, have avoided announcing their Indian heritage to teachers or classmates. Indeed, some considerable ambivalence about the extent to which Indian identity should be public in integrated settings was expressed in anxiety about media-derived stereotypic attributions and teasing: war whooping, etc. But there were also complaints that teachers and classmates were unaware of or insensitive to children's Indianness, on occasion even classifying them as members of other ethnic or racial groups more visible and familiar in the district.

This issue of visibility and identification surfaced for the program as a whole. In spite of central administration support for the Title IVA program and periodic class presentations by the program's Home-School Coordinator, "They still don't know we're here." Indeed, the Title IVA program's needs assessment survey in 1980 revealed significant differences between Indians and classroom teachers of Indian children, many of whom had been unaware that the program existed. When their ranked responses to survey questions were subjected

to value index rating, teachers were much less supportive of special programs for Indian children ("I treat all my children alike"), than were parents and youth, and much more likely to approve of cultural assimilation for all ethnic minorities. At the same time, the great majority of teachers surveyed described themselves as inadequately informed about Indian history and culture and many expressed interest in the development of curriculum material for use in their classrooms.

In January 1980, investigators were asked by several Title IVA staff members and parents if funding could be obtained for inservice training for Indian paraprofessionals and assistance in curriculum development. When the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program was identified as a potential funding source, investigators held a series of meetings with the Title IVA Parent Committee and staff in which the issues emerging from the preliminary investigation were clarified further and related to EHS Program goals and priorities. The objectives set forth in the final version of the subsequently funded proposal emerged from this responsive process.

IV

WORKSHOP DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section describes the design of the intervention and its implementation in a series of six workshops for pre- and inservice teachers, Indian heritage instructors, parents, and youth. It begins with an explanation of how elements of contact theory guided the selection of activities and how the rationale for those events were also informed by data obtained from sources in social psychology (cf. Cialdini, Petty, & Cacioppo, 1981; Tajfel, 1982; Reykowski, 1982). Next, the recruitment and selection procedures that determined the categorical basis for participant role taking will be followed by the nature of the task and reward systems that were negotiated between institutional settings. An examination of the nature of the structuring of communication and information will follow. The concluding paragraphs will call attention to certain critical activities that assumed thematic importance in the responsive evaluation process.

Contact Theory

Workshop directors found persuasive arguments for applying a theoretical framework to an inservice program whose objectives were to encourage communication and increase understanding between people of different ethnic or racial backgrounds (Stephens, 1969; Cohen, 1975). Contact theory (Allport, 1954; Cook, 1969) appeared to offer such a framework. A major premise of contact theory in its initial formulation was that inter-racial attitudes and behaviors were more closely related to social conditions than to any dispositional attributes. This position has been subsequently confirmed and has been comprehensively treated by Bronfenbrenner (1979).

Studies of attempts to reduce the stigmatization of educationally different and minority group children had reported highly promising results using elements of or elaborations of Allport's (1954) contact theory (Amir, 1976; St. John, 1975; Schofield & Sagar, 1977; Schofield, 1980, 1981; Slavin, 1979). These and other reports focused on children in classrooms. Little data appeared to have been published about its application to inservice programs for teachers who are, in fact, the critical intervention agents for improvement of interracial attitudes.

Nevertheless, given the favorable results from interventions with children, it seemed reasonable to expect that an inservice program that took account of process variables suggested by contact theory would be more effective than one following the usual, content-oriented approach, i.e., bringing interested adults together to impart surface information. Reviews of studies of attitude change have shown that events having a central impression on cognition are less resistant to extinction than are events with peripheral effects (cf. Cialdini, Petty & Cacioppo, 1981). The likelihood of achieving the project's objectives would be maximized if the major generalizations of contact theory could be cast into operational terms suitable for adults, thus integrating content with process variables.

Generalizations from contact theory suggested that if equal status was given to all participants engaging in experiences that foster mutual interdependence, such conditions would facilitate the emergence of a social climate where the norms would favor intergroup association. Moreover, if events were planned to assist people to exchange personal information, then perceptual accuracy would be increased and negative stereotypic attributions between groups

would be decreased. Thus the specific reference points for relevant process variables were as follows:

provisions for processes that provided equal status for all group members;

provisions for experiences that fostered mutual interdependence;

provisions for opportunities for the exchange of personal information.

Although these process variables were integral to the structure of workshop activities, the overt or explicit rationale for the intervention focused on content: the dissemination of accurate information about Indians. This decision was based on the Title IVA preliminary needs assessment data which concurred with the stated concerns of the parents, the teachers, the heritage instructors, and the advisors from the state education offices and other institutions. Not only did the Indians reveal a compelling need to "tell them like it is," but their comments indicated a recognition of informational gaps about their own heritage. Non-Indians expressed their concern about "teaching the 'right' things." This concordance of views established a set of expectancies in the minds of the participants for "what was going to happen in the workshops." The Indians would be the primary senders of information; the non-Indians, the receivers.

It was anticipated that a careful structuring of process and content variables would constitute a series of events that would (1) improve the perceptual accuracy between the two groups, Indians and non-Indians, and (2) provide a stage for motivating individuals to construct a set of norms that would decrease the psychological distance between self and others.

It was thought that the concentration of tasks on the needs and interests

of individuals and groups different from self would lead participants to use that knowledge to improve their tolerance levels of differences between people (cf. Reykowski, 1982). As differences diminished, it seemed reasonable to expect that the accumulation of that information would enhance the potential for a reciprocal reorganization of beliefs and attitudes, so that the perceived similarities between groups would be accentuated and perceptions of differences would be discounted (Tajfel, 1982). The hope was that these cognitive shifts (Reykowski, 1982) would provide the motivation for a continuation of efforts to achieve a rapprochement between the school and the Indian community that would transcend the pull of biases that impeded communication and understanding between both institutions.

Participant Recruitment

Participants were recruited by several methods. Inservice teachers and heritage instructors received letters that were either mailed or hand delivered. Initially only those inservice teachers having been identified by the district as having Indian children in their classroom received letters. Partly because repeated attempts to recruit teachers from junior and senior high schools in the district were unsuccessful and partly because of interest expressed by other elementary teachers, the criteria for selection were broadened to include any teacher who wished to participate. Both groups, heritage instructors and teachers, were seen either individually or in groups by one or both of the co-directors. Typically, a few introductory remarks were made and the audience followed an informational handout that described the project. A question and answer period followed with sessions lasting from 30 - 60 minutes.

Preservice teachers were drawn from a pool of students who planned to do

their student teaching at a time which coincided with the workshop schedule. Notices were placed in both college papers inviting prospective student teachers to inquire about the project. It happened that all but one student expressing interest had been enrolled in at least one college course of a co-director. Criteria for selection were based on grade point average, personal knowledge of the student's tact and maturity of judgment, and interest in multiculture education as determined by interviews.

Parents and youth were recruited by the Title IVA Program's Parent Committee by word of mouth.

The number of participants in the workshops was 43. The total included 17 elementary teachers, grades kindergarten through six; 12 heritage instructors, 6 preservice teachers assigned as student teachers in the district, 5 parents, and 3 youths. Also attending on an informal basis were district officials, other student teachers, and individuals from area Indian communities. In sum, the composition of the group was widely diversified in terms of age, professional training and status, and ethnic background. For convenience, and in accordance with the contact theoretic design of the intervention, participants were classified for the purpose of task assignments as "Indians" or "non-Indians/teachers" on the basis of institutional and professed ethnic affiliations. From time to time, however, these role affiliations shifted to reflect workshop events, providing one basis for alternations between role taking and role making.

Reward and task incentives. All personnel received meals, snacks, etc., and were reimbursed for transportation. Only heritage instructors and Indian parents not members of the advisory committee were paid for their participation

with project funds. Inservice teachers received tuition free course credits and salary increases appropriate as determined by school district policies.

All were given the option of receiving college credit. With the workshops' extensive focus on process variables and concentration on Indian content it was imperative that participants be able to translate and express their knowledge into a usable instructional format. Very early on some individuals made it known that the specific tasks predetermined as course requirements were either unsuitable for their particular situation or not of immediate interest to them. In keeping with the responsive evaluation design, individuals devised their own tasks and submitted an outline of their project(s) for instructor approval.

Workshop Design

Agenda schedules are described in Section V. Ideas for group activities were either already known to the co-directors or were drawn from a variety of instructional sources and group training manuals. All, to some extent, were revised to conform with the objectives of the program. The nature of the tasks and the characteristics of participants were also considered.

Structuring communication by grouping procedures. Using the elements of contact theory described above, the designers planned events so that the tasks would be interdependent. In other words, in order to complete an assignment, the information obtained by one group would be needed by another group and vice versa. Depending on the objective and the nature of the task, group assignments were homogeneous by ethnic/professional role, or were consciously structured to be heterogeneous by role and representatives from each role category were permutated within each task group. Thus, if there were six

different task or interest groups, each group might contain one student teacher, two heritage instructors, and two - three elementary teachers, and one parent or youth, etc.

The activities in Workshop I will illustrate how the assignments incorporated aspects of each process variable. Workshop members were divided into the two basic groups, Indians and non-Indians/teachers. Indians were asked to complete an inductive task that required them to rank order information they wanted to know. The information was to be categorized into three historical periods of Indian history: traditional, contact, and contemporary. (This three-fold classification of historical periods served throughout as the basic device for structuring all informational content.) In order to establish a framework for a beginning dialogue, both groups needed to clarify their own perceptions of perceived importance of items of information. It happened that the questions and answers independently arrived at were nearly identical. Indians wanted to tell non-Indians what they wanted to know. The effects of that consensus are described in the results section.

A second activity in Workshop I was to examine and evaluate instructional media. Again the events included the relevant process variables referred to above. Here the groups were heterogeneous. Preservice teachers and a small number of inservice teachers who expressly requested to attend the initial session were paired with one or more Native Americans. The objective of the exercise was to learn how to evaluate the accuracy of information and to present the results of that search to inservice teachers in Workshop II. A complementary sharing activity for inservice teachers was planned for Workshop II. There the task would be to reach consensus about their and the school's

instructional goals and values for multicultural education and negotiate their conclusions with the questions and answers derived from Workshop I. In other words, insofar as possible, provisions were made so that each group would be given an equal opportunity to complete a task of importance to the whole group.

A number of activities were perceived by participants and participant observers to be critical to the events that occurred on the workshop stage. In addition to the question and answer exercise described above, these included: in Workshop IV, the Fishbowl technique, and the parent activity interest group; the Jigsaws in Workshops V and VI; and the potluck dinner in Workshop VI.

The Fishbowl technique was adapted to enable people to listen to the concerns of one another. Prior to Workshop IV, the whole group exchanged information, either formally or informally, or by way of summarizing what had occurred in small group activities. In the Fishbowl, one group, the observers were arranged in an outer circle and instructed to complete a task sheet while listening to the deliberations of the other group, the discussants, who were arranged in an inner circle. It was felt that if each group were given alternative opportunities to distance themselves from a discussion of independent tasks of mutual interest, the observers would (a) become informed about the topic, and (b) gain further insight and objectivity into the perspective and feelings of others. This approach is best characterized as "a good idea gone wrong." The positive and negative consequences of these arrangements are discussed in Sections V and VI.

Workshop IV also provided participants with options to learn various

instructional strategies. Group arrangements were based on interest choices with permutations of members from each ethnic/professional role. Only parents elected to work on the topic of home/school relationships, and two student teachers were deliberately assigned to that group to maintain some semblance of heterogeneous composition. As parents began to work through the issues of linkage between institutions, with the objective of sharing the results of their task with the group at large, the idea for developing a series of critical home/school incidents for discussion by the group at large emerged. As will be described in Section V, these scenarios had the effect of establishing a strong sense of identity and agency for parents.

Jigsaw was adapted from Slavin's (1980) manual on cooperative team learning. The essential idea was to give each individual on a "home team" a portion of the information needed to complete a "home team" group task, i.e., to share with one another information about Indians in each of the three defined historical periods. Here each person was to become an "expert" on a particular topic, aided by a discussion of the information with counterparts from other "home teams." Each person would then be required to "teach" the topic to his/her "home team." Representatives from each status group were placed on each team using the method described above.

A final event, a potluck dinner, provided individuals with the opportunity to share food from their own ethnic backgrounds. Both of these episodes, the potluck and Jigsaw, seemed to serve as points of convergence.

Presentation of information. In response to requests by designers, the Native Americans submitted a list of speakers who they felt would best present the case for traditional culture to non-Indians. Two chiefs from nearby

reservations spoke on two separate occasions. During each responsive evaluation session with one of the co-directors, heritage instructors continued to lobby for more chiefs as speakers. In addition to their contributions in the events of the workshops, members of the heritage staff readily volunteered to make formal presentations and offered relevant written material and recommended audio-visual media. A later section describes how control of the flow of information contributed to Indians' sense of agency and to the reversal-of-dominance phenomena recorded by the participant observers.

A number of non-Indian consultants, specialists in their various fields, were hired. Included were an anthropologist, whose primary interest was in Native Americans of the local region, a college professor skilled in the organization of social studies curriculum, and a consultant trained in group processes from the state education office. From time to time, each of the co-directors presented anthropological data, information about attitude change, contact theory, etc. They also served as mediators in discussion groups as well as synthesizers and summarizers of topics and issues.

Responsive evaluation input. An integral part of the design was the responsive evaluation format. In addition to administering evaluation questionnaires at the conclusion of each workshop, the directors and the participant observers systematically solicited comments from participants. Pre- and inservice teachers were also interviewed informally during the senior author's rounds as supervisor of student teachers. A group of three to four heritage instructors from the city were interviewed formally prior to each workshop. They were consulted about forthcoming agendas and were asked to

express their reactions to previous workshop events. Telephone contacts and personal interviews with the Title IVA district heritage staff and with participating parents were conducted by another co-director. Meetings with a Project Advisory Committee of non-participating parents and district personnel (to whom co-directors reported periodically in accordance with Ethnic Heritage Studies Program regulations) also impacted on the design. An explanation of how these efforts and those described above contributed to the development of participants' sense of agency, investment and boundary definitions will be reported in the following sections.

V

ANALYSIS OF OBSERVATIONS AND INTERVIEWS

In analyzing the data from observations and interviews, investigators drew on symbolic interactionism and ethnicity theory for a conceptual framework that analyzes workshop dynamics as a process of presenting and negotiating role identities through structured interactions on the workshop stage. As previously noted, this focus on role identification emerged from observations made during the on-going responsive evaluation of workshop events and follows Parkin (1976) in recognizing that "verbalized roles are symbols, the information from which is constantly and selectively exchanged by persons in interaction" (p. 177). The principal outcome observed in this investigation was the negotiation of identity by Indian participants through interactions with other workshop participants and events. This negotiation occurred through the definition and redefinition of roles and the structuring and restructuring of ethnic boundaries. The role identity of "Indian" or "Native American" was defined through a process that moved from preliminary status recruitment through an initial, collective "role-taking" and the exploration of interethnic and professional status boundaries to personal "role-making" in which sub-group differentiations emerged and participants were able to move past boundary definition to a recognition of common or congruent interests.

In many respects, the workshops were a series of "dramatic" events in which directors set a stage, cast parts, and assigned roles. The process was interactive in that scripts were revised and rewritten in cooperation with participants. "Offstage" events affected the course of the production; actors

moved onto the set and off again; roles changed in the direction of extemporization. The use of these metaphors from theater provides a heuristically useful framework for presenting findings on workshop dynamics. A description and analysis of the observational record is followed by a brief discussion of responses to the interview protocol, as participants reflected back on their experience "onstage".

Analysis of Observations

Initial role taking. Role taking activities were especially apparent during the first workshop. After introductory remarks were made, directors divided participants into two "interest groups," labeling one "Native Americans" and the other "Teachers and Student Teachers" on the printed agenda. Each of these groups was assigned a different task. The "Native Americans" were directed to list items of concern as "information they regard as important for non-Indians to have" regarding three time periods: traditional/pre-contact, contact, and contemporary. Teachers and student teachers were directed to list "questions they would like answered and information they would like to have." These activities thus cast participants into clearly defined roles: the teachers were to ask questions; Indians were to help teach teachers.

Observations made during the interest group activities indicate that participants readily accepted their "parts." The teachers' group expressed no hesitancies in generating questions, beginning to write immediately as asked, sharing questions on cue, placing priorities on questions. Teachers generated a total of 70 questions on the three cultural periods. Questions that elicited the longest and most animated discussions were from the contemporary period and clustered around two principal concerns: "Who is an Indian/

how is tribal membership defined?" and "Do Indians feel discriminated against?" Native American participants also seemed to accept their parts, readily listed 68 different concerns for all three time periods, but were reluctant to rank order categories: "They're all important to us." Longest and most animated discussions also centered on contemporary concerns, as expressed in statements like: "Stereotyping continues today," "We don't ride horses and live in tipis," and "We're still here; we're not all drunks or dead."

These initial roles of "question askers" and "teachers of teachers" were explicitly defined by one of the teachers in the discussion period following lunch. In response to a question raised by another participant about what to call the two groups, a teacher suggested the labels "experts" and "amateurs." None of the other teachers or the Indians voiced any disapproval of these labels and workshop directors used them sporadically throughout the remainder of the session.

While the usage of the terms "experts" and "amateurs" diminished throughout the course of Workshop II and disappeared from explicit usage by Workshop IV, many of the characteristics of the initial role taking persisted. During "resource group" activities, observers noted a number of instances in which teachers presented materials to Indians for comment. This was especially evinced in the "trade books" group in which teachers repeatedly solicited comments from Indian parents and students, asking questions such as "What do you think of the drawings in this book?" or "Does this present a wrong view of the use of masks?" In every instance observed, the teacher accepted the Indians' judgments and recorded their reactions on their worksheets.

Analysis of verbal interactions during general discussion sessions in the workshops also documents the persistence of the "expert" and "amateur" roles. Five verbal interaction sequences selected at random from general discussions recorded in field notes revealed the following frequencies of interactions among participants other than directors (see Table 1). The sample analyzed demonstrates a discussion pattern in which teachers primarily asked questions and Indians primarily answered questions and made open comments. In these samples, most of the teachers' questions directed to individuals and all of the teachers' questions directed to groups were directed to Indians. While Indians asked many questions of speakers, these samples suggest that they rarely asked questions of teachers.

Role taking processes were also demonstrated in the seating patterns of participants. For the most part, participants chose to sit in clusters based on job locale and familiarity. Teachers from the same schools sat near each other: heritage instructors sat with colleagues from their schools; parents sat together, as did student teachers. Such clustering occurred spontaneously, especially during coffee time before sessions and at lunch. During Workshops II, III, and IV, a dramatic departure from this pattern was observed. As they moved from the coffee room to the formal meeting area in Workshop II, participants seated themselves around three long tables. Teachers and student teachers seated themselves at the table on the right side of the room, with a few participants sitting at the central table. Native American participants seated themselves at the table on the left. Thus, without any direction to do so, participants sat in "blocks" with no intermingling. Even though tables were rearranged into a "horseshoe pattern" for Workshops III and IV, this same

TABLE 1. Verbal Interaction Sequences

Questions	"Native Americans"	"Teachers"
Open questions to all participants	5%	10%
Questions directed to individuals		25%
Questions addressed to groups	5%	40%
Comments		
General comments (open expressions of opinion)	30%	20%
Responses to questions asked by other participants	60%	5%
	TOTAL 100%	100%
Percentage of total discussion	55%	45%

general seating pattern continued. This pattern further describes the degree to which participants assumed their Native American and Teacher roles on the workshop stage.

The roles that directors assigned participants were thus based on preliminary status distinctions made during the recruitment process and established a clear separation and complementarity between the parts to be played by Indians and teachers. Complementary role-taking played upon the linked oppositions of ethnicity and professional/educational status by inverting the "offstage" status hierarchy; teachers became "learners" or "amateurs"; parents and paraprofessionals became "teachers" or "experts."

Boundary marking processes. In addition to the initial role-taking processes, boundaries between Indians and non-Indians were also delineated as actors sought to define the meaning of "Indianness." Native American participants exerted a number of controls over this definition process, which initially developed as a series of contrastive oppositions between "Indian" and "White" traditional culture and historical experience.

During the initial sessions of the workshops there emerged a consensus among Indian participants that "Indians should define Indianness." This consensus was expressed formally through self-introductions and informally through conversations with Indian participants.

A major shift in programming occurred after lunch in the first workshop as the result of one heritage instructor's comment to a director that "you introduced yourselves and your goals. I have goals for being here too. We want some time to express our goals." This was the first recorded instance of one of the "actors" requesting an opportunity to help write the "script."

Directors agreed to his request and afternoon agenda items were delayed to give all participants time to introduce themselves and their reasons for attending. In these introductions, all Native Americans made reference to tribal status as well as occupational status. Non-Indians introduced themselves with reference only to occupational status. During conversations over lunch, observers noted that many of the teachers continued their "question asking" role, exploring especially questions of tribal identification. Several Indians used this opportunity to express a number of boundary markers such as the following:

> "We're the only people in the world who have to sign papers to prove who we are."
>
> "We can always tell other Indians by their speech--even over the phone when we have never met before."
>
> "Our tribe has records of our people for generations. We know who is a member."
>
> "Part of our job is to let everyone know we're proud of who we are. Some people we call 'Wanna-be's,' they're whites who would like to be Indians, but aren't."

These conversational markers and others helped establish ethnic boundaries by expressing a desire to control definitions of ethnicity.

Initial role taking and boundary marking processes also centered on the question of "what to call the Indians?" As noted earlier, one expression of this concern generated the labels "expert" and "amateur." Fieldnotes record very infrequent use of those labels, however; primarily the usages by directors during the afternoon session of Workshop I with limited occurrence in Workshop II and disappearance of the term by Workshop IV. Teachers responded to the question of "what to call Indians?" with language hesitancies, especially during Workshops I and II. At least seven instances of teachers beginning

sentences and stopping abruptly at the word "Indian" were recorded. From Workshop III on, teachers used primarily the term "Native American." Indians were observed to use the terms "Indian," "Native people" and "Native American" interchangeably as well as tribal names.

Control over the definition of "Indianness" was also expressed in discussions of Native American cultural symbols. The following transcribed vignette from a discussion of a filmstrip on "Indian stereotypes" in Workshop II is illustrative. In the coding of participant identities, H = heritage teachers, C = classroom teacher, P = parents, S = student teachers, N = Native American guest speakers, and W = workshop staff. Observer's annotations to the field notes are enclosed with [ ].

H8: "One thing I'd like to point out is the pictures used to show things. Indians are shown in past situations, contrasting years ago and today. It's important to stress we are still around. . . . Here an Indian is pictured wearing a headdress and feathers. Every day in life Indians don't wear feathers. Only at special times do Indians wear special things. [C12 asks question about teacher's guide. Discussion on how to prepare to teach.]

H8: "Other questions?"

C1: I suspect some conflicting information in the filmstrip, mixed messages from the pictures--no feathers, then feathers in a later frame" [questioning use of feathers as one stereotype earlier in the filmstrip, showing contemporary people in headdress later].

H8: "I'd compare it to Reagan wearing a morning coat--an American dressed up."

C1: "That's not what I'm saying. Kids are sharp enough to pick up a message."

H8: "Do you mean the damage involved with an Indian stereotype used by Indians?"

W4: "This raises the question of what is a symbol. There is a difference between a stereotype and a symbol."

H8: "That's hard to get across to kids."

C1: "I don't think it is so hard for kids."

C12: "Maybe this will help us clear this up. In my units I show traditional costuming then compare it to now. Is it bad to focus on costume?"

H8: "This is OK--to compare then to now."

C12: "As long as it is not just now and traditional?"

H1: "Indian dress is not a costume!"

C12: "What would be appropriate? Indian dress?"

H1: "How about 'past dress' and now?"

H6: "I think it's good to use an identification like feathers, adapting to different cultures. It's being ourselves and not stereotyping ourselves. It's adapting, bringing both in."

This particular discussion demonstrates attempts by Native American participants to establish control of the interpretation of this cultural symbol. Teachers seemed to focus on the filmstrip itself--how to use it and how to help children understand it. Native Americans expressed concern for the control of the meaning and attribution of "feathers," suggesting that if Native Americans use feathers they are ethnic symbols; if non-Native Americans use them, they may be stereotypes. In this instance and others, Native Americans marked boundaries between themselves and non-Native Americans by establishing control over the issue of the definition of "Indianness."

As definition by contrast proceeded through the display of emblematic cultural forms as symbols of Indianness, control over the definition process was further exerted by the selective presentation of cultural information and critiques of its misappropriation by non-Indians.

Tangible displays included the graphics and artifacts mounted in the Title IVA Resource Room (which served as backdrop for a number of task groups in the course of the workshops), beadwork and other personal ornamentation worn by Indian participants, and, at the culminating "ethnic potluck," corn soup and moose meat set out in contrast with the European and Afro-American foods brought by non-Indian participants.

Principal responsibility for presenting "traditional" culture was taken by two elders from area Indian communities who had been suggested as speakers by parents and staff of the Title IVA program (for which they have served as resource persons). Their presentations in Workshops II and III included displays of a wide range of cultural artifacts and visual aids (gustowehs, clan symbols, calendars, diagrams, maps) as well as numerous references to instances of misuse and misrepresentation of traditional cultural forms by "Whites": "White men trying to write about Indians like they know what they are talking about."

Elders' discourse on traditional religion made reference to the esoteric meaning of symbols and to what was not proper or possible to share with non-Indian lay persons. This withholding of information was presented (and accepted by teachers) as a corrective to the distortion and trivialization of sacred knowledge in non-Indian instructional materials; in the process, it nicely underlined the right of Indian people to determine what should be known about them.

Another means of drawing cultural contrast was a series of references to professed core values. The elders in particular included numerous such references in their presentations, referring to familism, spirituality, generosity,

honesty, and reverence for nature. These references were punctuated with references to contrasts with White culture such as

> "Today you Whites are turning your backs on nature and all that is out there."
>
> "One of the worst things White men brought was (inflexible, regimenting) time."

A dramatic expression of one such core value occurred in the discussion following a film on Netsilik Eskimo culture in Workshop IV. When the presenter (a non-Native American education consultant) began to describe some of the difficulties he found in discussion "religion" in social studies, one of the Native Americans replied very strongly "That's <u>your</u> problem--we have no problem with seeing religion as all-embracing, not just a once-a-week thing."

Historical experience provided further imagery for definition by contrast. Two themes emerged in elicited responses and informal dialogue: the unique, primordial nature of the Indian experience in America ("We were put here by the Creator; everybody else came afterwards") and the historical injustices suffered by Native people at the hands of Whites. Both themes appeared in discussions of why Columbus had not "discovered" America and in the issue of treaty rights and sovereignty, to which one vocal Indian parent (who also teaches in one of the central city's heritage programs and is active in land claims concerns) repeatedly returned.

These boundary-marking processes are instructively exemplified in an exchange regarding Thanksgiving, one of a number on this subject:

> Workshop II AM session [discussion of texts and resources]
>
> H1: "Sometimes I get upset at Thanksgiving."
>
> C12: "Really, we're trying our best. We talk about hardships but five year olds have different understandings. What would you

suggest? We do headdresses too--after discussion of how Indians celebrate Thanksgiving."

H1: "Indians celebrate Thanksgiving 365 days a year. That is the harvest feast. What it's about is surviving hardships. Indian women cooking in a book is romanticized--it is the wrong time of the Indian year."

H6: "Capitalize on your approach!"

C12: "We do--we discuss various kinds of houses. We only wore headdresses the last day. It was a party--to celebrate the harvest. When the TV people came, they emphasized just the last day."

H8: "Sounds to me like you are taking the right approach."

H1: "White people don't do wrong deliberately. They don't know it."

W4: "We're trying to understand. The Pilgrims were grateful to the Indians? We're thankful for all we have?"

H8: "There are lots of different versions of the first Thanksgiving. My version is the Thanksgiving after the massacre of 500 Indians--the Pilgrims thanking their lord for sending the Indians to the devil."

H6: "That's the idea many Native Americans have about the Indians and the Pilgrims."

C12: "I'm glad you're part of the school system. As resources, it's better than the library."

[discussion shifts to other resources]

In this discussion, the specific cultural reference is to the cycle of Thanksgiving rituals in the traditional Iroquois ceremonial calendar, but the speaker is also alluding to the generalized core value of spirituality as a continuous and pervasive orientation, in contrast with the non-Indian limitation of giving thanks to a once-a-year holiday. Another speaker makes use of historical contrast to present Pilgrim-Indian relations as Indians understand (or should understand) them; Thanksgiving is not always a joyous celebration, because Indians remember the massacres as well as the festive exchange of food.

Here control over the definition of inter-ethnic boundaries is exercised through a reappropriation of Indian historical experience. To their frequent chagrin, Indian people have been mainly presented in elementary classrooms only at Thanksgiving time, as "the friends of the Pilgrims."

Speakers in this discussion further exemplify the role taking behaviors of Indians as "teachers of teachers" and teachers as "question askers" or "learners." In this instance, teachers were not only asking questions but seeking approval as well, for their past good intentions at least if not for what they have taught.

Boundary processes and workshop structure. During the first two workshops in particular, Indians appeared to be saying in a number of ways that "This is our stage and our forum. We accept our parts and will work to tailor them to fit our needs." While the workshop format encouraged all Indians present to be resource persons and "teach teachers," some participants more readily assumed this role and played it with more frequency and zest than did others. Articulate, assertive spokespersons dominated many of the encounters on the workshop stage, taking initiatives in answering questions and challenging workshop staff or presenting consultants.

Their role was especially important in the responsive interplay between concerns expressed by participants and the structure of workshop events. Throughout the processes of role-taking and boundary marking, workshop activities were simultaneously providing a structure to interaction and being themselves structured by the interaction of participants.

One of the clearest demonstrations of this interaction was the reallocation of time schedules in workshop agendas. As described earlier, directors

responded to a request from one of the Native American participants in the first workshop to allow time for all participants to introduce themselves. This was the first of a series of major departures from planned agendas in response to concerns expressed by participants and primarily to concerns expressed by Native American participants. These time reallocations are documented in Table 2. The pattern emerging in these reallocations is a shifting away from time allocated for developing instructional strategies and toward Native American speakers and open discussion primarily dominated by Native American participants.

While these time reallocations demonstrate instances where "actors" actively helped write and rewrite the workshop "scripts," at least six events written and directed very tightly by the workshop staff played critical roles in structuring the negotiation of identity. The first such event was the division of participants into two clearly defined ethnic groups in Workshop I. As discussed earlier, this division of participants into two "interest groups" served to heighten the establishment of ethnic boundaries and role taking behaviors by participants.

The second such event was the Fishbowl activity in Workshop III. During the afternoon session, teachers were directed to sit together in an inner circle for a presentation and Native Americans were asked to sit in an outer circle and "observe." This was the first time that all participants were divided formally into two groups in each others' presence. The ensuing discussion resulted in a heightened sense of "we/them" as manifest by an increased frequency of "us/them" statements by all discussants and numerous nonverbal indications of discomfort (facial expressions, fidgeting in seats, shaking heads). While directors tried

Table 2

Time Re-allocations in Workshop Sessions

Workshop I

Scheduled Agenda		Actual Time Span	
1:15 - 2:00	Walk-thru Milne Library	1:15 - 2:45	Introduction, comments by participants
2:15 - 3:30	Resource Groups	3:00 - 3:30	Resource Groups

Total time re-allocated - 90 minutes

Workshop II

9:00 - 9:30	Coffee		
9:30 - 9:35	Welcome and Introductions - Sue Roark-Calnek	9:30 -10:05	Welcome and Introductions + comments by participants
9:35- 10:15	Unlearning Indian Stereotypes - Keith Reitz	10:05 -1:05	Unlearning Indian Stereotypes = discussion
10:15 -10:40	The Native American Mosaic - Russell Judkins	11:05 -12:15	The Native American Mosaic + discussion
10:40 -10:50	Break		
10:50 -11:30	Indian Children in Public Schools: One Family's Views - Cornelius Abrams and Marge Abrams		Omitted
11:30 -12:10	Discussion Groups: What Can Schools Do?		See below
12:10 -12:30	Sharing and Reporting		
12:30 - 1:30	Box Lunch - (Workshop registration and advisement on individual projects; walk-through of the Native American Resource Room)		
1:30 - 2:25	Traditional Iroquois Culture- Huron Miller	1:30 - 2:05	Registration
2:25 - 2:30	Break	2.05 - 3:30	Traditional Iroquois Culture - Huron Miller
2:30 - 2:45	Working Groups ___Evaluating teaching resources ___Goals and values for multi-ethnic teaching	3:30 - 3:50	Discussion - What Can Schools Do?

Total time re-allocated - 80 minutes

Workshop III

Scheduled Agenda		Actual Time Span	
9:00 - 9:30	Coffee		
9:30 - 9:45	Where We've Been and Where We're Going - Sue Roark-Calnek	9:40 - 10:00	Where We've Been and Where We're Going - Sue Roark-Calnek
9:45 - 10:05	Removing Barriers to Communication - Zeke Chevalier	10:00 - 10:40	Removing Barriers to Communication - Zeke Chevalier
10:05 - 11:30	Working Groups ____Evaluating teaching resources ____Goals and values for multi-ethnic teaching	10:40 - 11:45	Working Groups
11:30 - 12:30	Group Reports and Sharing	11:45 - 12:30	Group Reports and Sharing
12:30 - 1:00	Box Lunch	12:30 - 1:30	Box Lunch
1:00 - 2:00	Iroquois Culture and the Schools - Corbett Sundown	1:40 - 2:40	Iroquois Culture and the Schools - Corbett Sundown
2:00 - 3:00	Teaching About Native Americans: Evaluating the New York State Curriculum - Corbett Sundown, Russell Judkins (Observation Group I)	2:40 - 3:45	Teaching About Native Americans: Evaluating the New York State Curriculum - Corbett Sundown, Russell Judkins + discussion
3:00 - 4:00	Teaching About Native Americans: Integrating Two Modes of Instruction - John Herlihy (Observation Group II)		Postponed

Total time re-allocated - 90 minutes

Workshop IV

Scheduled Agenda		Actual Time Span	
9:00 - 9:30	Coffee	9:00 - 9:40	Coffee
9:30 - 9:40	Review of Coming Attractions - Sue Roark-Calnek	9:40 - 10:05	Review of Coming Attractions - Sue Roark-Calnek
9:45 - 10:45	Integrating Two Modes of Instruction - John Herlihy	10:05 - 12:15	Integrating Two Modes of Instruction - John Herlihy
10:45 - 12:15	Mini-Workshops I	12:15 - 1:00	Lunch
12:15 - 12:45	Lunch	1:00 - 2:40	Mini-Workshops I
12:45 - 1:30	Comparing Two Cultures Elliott Ricehill	2:40 - 3:00	Group Meeting - Share Reports
1:30 - 3:00	Mini-Workshops II	3:00 - 3:20	Break
3:00 - 4:00	Free Choice: ____ Individual and Group Project ____ Continuing of Planning for Workshop V	3:20 - 3:50	Comparing Two Cultures - Elliott Ricehill

Total time re-allocated - 125 minutes

Workshop V

Scheduled Agenda		Actual Time Span	
3:30 - 4:30	Films on Native Americans	3:30 - 4:30	Films on Native Americans
4:30 - 4:40	Coffee - Announcements	4:30 - 4:40	Coffee Announcements
4:40 - 6:00	Work Session ____ Teaching Units ____ Special Projects	4:40 - 6:00	Work Session ____ Teaching Units ____ Special Projects
6:00 - 6:30	Dinner	6:00 - 6:45	Dinn er
6:30 - 7:30	Team Learning	6:45 - 8:10	Team Learning
7:30 - 8:30	Home-School Coordination	8:10 - 8:30	Home-School Coordination

Total time re-allocated - 40 minutes

to follow this discussion with attempts to list curricular implications, participants left quickly with little interaction and few completed assigned worksheets. A Native American parent and two students approached the directors to complain about the procedure. It may well be that this "scripted" event made very explicit the underlying ethnic boundaries that had previously been less explicit. While participants had previously marked boundaries in many ways themselves, on this occasion directors marked boundaries for them.

The third such event was the Fishbowl activity in Workshop IV. In the morning session roles were reversed. Teachers were directed to observe from the outer circle; Native Americans to sit in the inner circle (modified now as "arcs" to lessen the discomfort of being observed). During this second Fishbowl activity, discussion became more animated with some remarks indicating possible hostilities between groups (see the following section on role making).

The fourth event, critical for Indian parents, was a "miniworkshop" on home-school coordination, taking place in the afternoon of Workshop IV. Other Indian participants--the paraprofessional staff of the heritage programs--elected to join teachers in other miniworkshops on specific instructional strategies. Parents and one student developed and discussed "critical incident" scenarios on problems encountered by Indian children in schools. These scenarios dramatized thematic concerns about the presentation of identity and failed communications. In Workshop V they were briefly shared with other participants in small, heterogeneous discussion groups led by the parents.

The fifth and sixth critical activities were the Jigsaw cooperative team learning strategies used in Workshops V and VI. For these activities each

participant was assigned to a group, each group carefully balanced by directors for a mix of Native Americans and teachers. Participants met in these heterogeneous groups to define learning tasks, get acquainted, and set purposes for learning. Each member then moved to another group to study and discuss specific topics before returning to the base groups for dissemination of information and discussion. While observers in each group noted that most of the verbal interactions were task oriented, informal interactions among participants and intermingling of Native Americans and teachers increased after the tasks were completed. Even after the sessions ended, many participants remained in their assigned rooms to talk. On these occasions, directors again revised the script. Having earlier divided participants into two large ethnic groups, directors now divided participants into smaller "mixed" groups. The observers noted that the "actors" readily assumed these different roles.

Shifts toward role making. As the workshops progressed, observers began to note numerous interaction sequences in which participants not only "played" the parts assigned to them in role-taking, but began to actively modify those parts as well. These "role-making" behaviors were especially marked in the Workshop IV Fishbowl, where in addition to their separation from and task complementarity with teachers, Indians were asked for the first time since Workshop I to reach consensus on individual responses to questions about Indian culture.

As described earlier in this report, one of the Native Americans responded strongly to a presenter's comments about the difficulties in teaching religion in social studies. This response marked a role shift of sorts, from "teaching

teachers" to actively debating issues with presenters. As discussion progressed, an even more dramatic role making instance occurred. When one of the teachers seated in the outer circle expressed confusion about the religious topics being discussed and asked a question about content to include in a teaching unit, one of the Native Americans responded "I don't see why we should come down to your level. I challenge you to come up to our level." This remark produced a dramatic juncture with many teachers sitting up abruptly and visibly frowning. None of the teachers responded. Native Americans murmured among themselves. The presenter quickly summarized his presentation and abruptly introduced a workshop staff member, remarking about the lateness of the time and the need to follow a schedule. Early in the ensuing lecture on contact history and contemporary Indian life, another Native American interrupted,

> "You keep saying 'Native Americans are . . . ." We're not all the same. We're different from each other just like everyone else. We don't all agree."

The presenter responded with a commentary about that not being the intention and quickly introduced a lunch break. Over lunch, several Native Americans commented to observers about differences of opinion among Native Americans born and raised on reservations and those raised in cities. One participant noted hostilities between those "married to Whites" and others in the Indian community. For the first time in their field notes, observers noted uses of the word "racist," and in application by Indians to other Indians. During one of the afternoon miniworkshop sessions, a brief but heated exchange occurred between two Indian participants on the subject of religion as an appropriate marker of authentic Indianness; one defended (and identified with) Christians as "real Indians" equally with adherents of traditional religion.

These exchanges indicate a dramatic extension of the roles originally played. Certain actors, it would seem, were now altering their roles to address the inter-ethnic boundary in more forceful, agonistic terms than had been previously done. In particular, "come up to our level" explicitly projected onto the teachers present the previously generalized issue of non-Indian ignorance and cultural insensitivity, and in language that made equally explicit reference to the inversion or reversal of the "outside" professional/educational status hierarchy.

Other Indians were responding by marking degrees of distance between themselves and other "actors" in their group. These comments thus mark explicit expressions of emerging sub-group identifications among the originally "blocked" Native American group.

Boundary Convergences. In Workshops V and VI observers noted several instances where participants seemed to demonstrate tendencies to transcend boundaries and relate to each other in new ways.

An important event in this transition process was the presentation by a Native American speaker at the conclusion of Workshop IV. Alluding to the hostilities expressed earlier in the day, this speaker made a careful attempt to address unspoken concerns of the teachers, remarking at one point, "I can feel your confusion. I don't think we ought to intimidate you. I feel you should be commended for being here." Teachers responded to this presentation with a number of questions, expressing a higher degree of interest and involvement than at any other time of the day. In their written evaluations of the session, three teachers noted

"He made us feel good about being here."

"Finally someone seems to realize we are trying."

"He seemed to know we needed some support too."

During the Jigsaw activities of Workshops V and VI, observers recorded an increase in both the frequency and affability of encounters between Native Americans and teachers. Seating patterns also reflected a much greater mixing of teachers and Native Americans.

The "ethnic potluck" dinner in Workshop VI, during which observers noted particularly affable and informal discussion between participants, was an appropriate culminating event for the workshops in that for the first time forms (foods, recipes) emblematic of Indian ethnicity were set out side by side and exchanged with parallel forms emblematic of the ethnic heritage of non-Indian participants. It can be argued that this commensality in itself symbolized a reordering of ethnic boundary relations, from the encapsulation of Indian ethnic identity through complementary but asymmetric role-taking toward a state of affairs where everyone, equally, could have something to teach and something to learn.

In their comments during the final Jigsaw activity, several participants explicitly mentioned shifts toward boundary convergence. Two such comments are illustrative:

> H5: "We liked the openness of the teachers--in the first two workshops it was as if we were playing against each other, but in the fourth workshop people spoke out and we started to work together."
>
> C5: "I think we were able to progress from a definite feeling of non-communication and strange uneasiness to a comfortable feeling of one of a group--open to questions and differing points of view."

In their written responses, four heritage instructors and two parents expressed

"better understanding of non-Indians." Five heritage instructors and two parents "liked the cooperation of the teachers." All of the teachers noted "increased awareness of cultural differences" and "increased awareness of stereotypes and misconceptions."

Analysis of Interview Responses

The content and thematic analysis of interview responses provide further exemplification of the dynamics discussed above and shed light on how participants interpreted, at least retrospectively, their experiences on the workshop stage. Respondents were interviewed from one to six months after the last workshop. A comparison of their responses with the observational record shows some significant differences as well as similarities of reporting, and suggests that recollections of initial role taking and events early in the workshop series may have undergone some recasting, perhaps in response to later workshop dynamics and the salience of particular outcomes to particular participants.

In transcriptions of interview responses, identities are coded as in the observational record: H = heritage staff, C = classroom teacher, P = parent, S = student teacher, N = Native American guest speaker, and W = workshop staff. In addition, F = nonparticipant member of the Project Advisory Committee. Numbers to the right of letters designate individual respondents; numbers to the left indicate the total in each status category who responded in a given way.

Perceptions of initial role-taking. At one step removed from the workshop stage, a parent member of the Project Advisory Committee who had followed the workshops through the participation of his wife, child and friends, spoke for them with insight:

W2: "How did the workshops contribute to (learning about Indians)?"

F2: "Broadened . . . gave Indian people that I knew who were in the workshops more common links; confirmed their feelings about being Indian."

W2: "How? Can you say something more about that?"

F2: "Opportunity to define it to themselves, not just to the teachers . . . by virtue of having to say to the teachers who they were."

W2: "Think that helped?"

F2: "Yeah."

That this was indeed what participants, Indians and teachers alike, thought the workshops were about is indicated from responses to questions about workshop goals. All respondents except for three teachers (who preferred a phrasing in terms of generalized "multi-cultural awareness") described the goals as ones of increasing knowledge and understanding of Indian people and their cultural heritage. Answers to questions in the first cluster "What have you learned from . . . ?" show a similar focus. The question, "What did you learn about education?" elicited responses on instructional content--what to teach about Indians (7C, 3H, 1P)--rather than on instructional process--how to teach (3C, 1S) despite the attention given to instructional strategies in the design of workshop activities.

The focus on content about Indians was associated in respondents' perceptions with two elements of the role taking process: an ordering of participants into two, initially undifferentiated "we/they" categories on the basis of ethnic affiliation, and an "onstage" reversal of roles in the "offstage" professional/educational status hierarchy. Responses show that these role arrangements, so prominent in the observational record, were initially accepted

by many participants with what were retrospectively reported as reservations or concerns; some of these were to surface in verbal exchanges in the role-making, differentiating phase of workshop interaction.

Thus, no fewer than 20 respondents (6H, 4P, 1F, 6C, 2S) volunteered perceptions of an initial "polarization" or opposition of Indians and non-Indians when asked if they had noticed any changes in workshop participants. Other references to negative feelings about "we/they" opposition appeared in responses to questions about contacts with participants, roles played in the workshops, and what had been learned about other people, even when respondents continued to use "we/they" language to describe this learning.

All but three Indian respondents phrased workshop goals asymmetrically and with agency as "teaching the teachers." But more consensus was expressed among Indians, and between Indians and teachers, about teachers as "learners" and "amateurs" than about Indians as "experts." A recurrent theme in Indian responses was a claim to surprise in discovering that "non-Indians don't know very much about Indians, especially teachers--kind of amazed they didn't know more" (H8) but that teachers were "really willing to learn."

Teacher responses to questions about "experts and amateurs" and their own workshop role show them for the most part actively identifying with a "learner" role:

> C7: "For the first part I was just soaking up so much, so many new things, I really felt like a sponge. I felt inadequate, insufficient since I wasn't able to contribute too much. I don't know why I felt like that."

Seven of the eleven teachers and two of the four student teachers responding represented this "learner" role not (or not simply) as a reversal of their "off-stage" role but as an extension and confirmation of it: teachers, and elementary

teachers in particular (in contrast with secondary teachers located higher in the professional status hierarchy) should be "open to learning" and willing to "grow." "Anyone who uses the same lesson plan year after year should be a plumber, not a teacher" (C13). But some teachers made oblique references to colleagues who had complained privately backstage about Indian paraprofessionals' critiques of established instructional resources.

Although Indian respondents agreed with teachers that Indians had been defined as "experts" on the workshop stage, a surprising majority (3P, 7H, 1Y) expressed some personal discomfort with applying the label to themselves, and as many described their own role as one of "learning" as described it as "teaching." In what was said about their role and that of other Indians, they expressed some ambivalence regarding the role taking process and how control had been exerted over boundary definition.

That Indians could "teach the teachers" was seen as attractive, not only as an immediate corrective to stereotyping and misinformation, but for the opportunity it afforded for venting status-linked frustrations:

> P1: "The parents felt they were listened to . . . (they) were angry after years of not being listened to. (They had a) captive audience, at times they got carried away."

The same parent articulated a theme reiterated in the responses of parents in particular: that of heightened agency and self-confidence in dealing with schools:

> P1: "There's the old myth . . . aura . . . of the school house, they're there, they're smarter than you are, regardless if you've got a higher education than they have. You trust them first and foremost. (Now) I can say, 'this book is really inappropriate . . .' not that I want them to burn it, but . . . 'please use it with this in mind.' I feel comfortable in doing that."

Increased agency was indicated also in the extent to which Indian respondents, more often than teachers, attributed changes in the workshops to participant initiatives or to responsive interactions with workshop staff (7H, 4P, 1Y, 2C, 1S). Indians repeatedly used language identifying themselves with workshop design and implementation, either by reference to the responsive dialogue of the initial planning stage or by reference to feedback to staff which led to design modification:

Y1: "(with reference to the Workshop III Fishbowl) After I talked to you and you had other complaints from teachers and parents . . . I knew you'd do something about it."

H6: "You saw we weren't comfortable and you were willing to alter (procedures) to suit our needs. At first, it was your program, then all of a sudden, it became ours."

The same heritage instructor vigorously defended her role as assertive spokesperson:

H6: "(I was) an example of . . . that Native people are still alive and kicking . . . let them know we're not in the past, bridge the gap between them and now . . . and we have an interest, not a silent minority, we want to be heard . . . we have points of view."

But other Indian respondents, including the youth quoted above, demurred:

Y1: "(again with reference to the Workshop III Fishbowl) You had to say it for the group and not for yourself."

W4: "What do you mean by 'group'?"

Y1: "The group that you were pushed into . . . the Indians and the teachers."

W2: "You felt that made you part of a monolithic group?"

Y1: "Yeah . . . like we had to symbolize something."

Troubling for some Indians was the sense that they were all, equally, expected to be knowledgeable resource persons on traditional culture:

H2: "I told them in the beginning, 'I hope they don't ask me about culture.' I don't know too much; I was brought up on the reservation, but it wasn't any different from living here."

P4: "(explaining self-identification as an 'amateur') . . . simply because I have not been brought up on the reservation. I didn't have legends read to me. Basically, I was an Indian brought up in a White community. Before this (Title IVA) program, my only heritage was the label, 'I am an Indian.'"

For these respondents, drawing the ethnic boundary by primary reference to "traditional" culture left them with relatively little to say. But other respondents appealed to "traditional" core values and communicative styles in retrospectively accounting for why they had deferred to other Indian spokespersons:

H3: "I could have been a little more vocal than I usually am. As a rule we don't talk much . . . (that's) true of many Native Americans; we don't express, keep (things) inside."

H9: "Some of us are afraid to say how it is because we don't know how . . . hard to say without hurting people's feelings."

H3: "(H8) knows how to say it . . . without hurting other people. Blacks don't care who gets hurt."

Perceptions of role-making in workshop dynamics. For a number of Indian and non-Indian participants, their sense of emerging workshop dynamics--what structured interaction in the direction of more open communication--was bound up with the question of who spoke for Indian people:

W2: "Any difference between your role in the workshops and the role that (N1) and (N2) took?"

H6: "Yeah--they dispensed information."

P2: "They're elders."

H6: "They reflect everything we were saying."

W2: "You want to expand on that?"

H6: "They're proofs of what we were saying, in their lives, what they know."

C7: "From a teacher's point of view, listening to the chiefs was perhaps the most effective and dramatic way of helping us to understand the big differences. They put into words very clearly the Indian point of view. Up to that point, we had been hearing a lot of Native Americans who were angry . . . but I'm not sure that they really had a clear focus of why the gaps (in knowledge) were there on our part . . . . I think they felt very suspicious as to our motives, and that it wasn't until they saw some genuine reaction to the chiefs, whom they obviously held in great respect, that they began to see and trust a little."

Interview responses show more extensive documentation for perceptions that the Fishbowls, and in particular the agonistic, confrontationist exchanges of the Workshop IV Fishbowl, were the critical incidents in workshop dynamics, focusing issues for participants on both sides of the ethnic boundary and bringing to center stage previously backstage, unexpressed or unexamined differences among them.

Questions about workshop procedures elicited more references to the Fishbowls (by 17 participants: 5C, 1S, 6H, 3P, 1F, 1Y) than to any other activity; all but one of these references (that of H7, a non-Indian teaching professional working with the center city's heritage program) were couched in strongly negative terms. The Fishbowls were perceived as aberrations (H6: "That was a completely different procedure from before and after") or as low turning points after which the workshop structure and participant interaction moved from "we/they" polarization toward more open communication. It is possibly significant that in describing the contour of the workshops, respondents tended to place the Fishbowls as falling early in the series rather than, as they did, at midpoint. They thus recalled a greater span of interaction time spent in

moving toward convergence across the ethnic boundary than was actually the case.

Paradoxically, while the Fishbowls were remembered as formalizing "we/they" distinctions (H5: "Felt like we were supposed to be divided") some respondents also recalled them as occasions on which teachers and Indians were equally confused and discomfited:

> S3: "We weren't alienated (during the Workshop III Fishbowl) because the Native Americans felt sympathetic to us in the center. We were frustrated in the middle, didn't know what to do. There was . . . even some unity about the Fishbowls. We felt we--the teachers and the Native Americans--we were united against the professionals (workshop staff and academic consultants). I felt closer to the Native Americans that day."
>
> H2: "(The Workshop IV consultant) could have put it in plainer English. (Even) the teachers didn't understand him. I heard them talking about it."

It might indeed be argued that the Fishbowl dynamics, by projecting concerns about status hierarchy and the language of boundary definition onto outside, superordinate academic consultants and staff, contributed to emerging perceptions of common interests. What is more certain is that in the Workshop IV Fishbowl and subsequent interactions, differentiation among Indian participants and, to a lesser extent, among teachers became more apparent:

> H5: "I was surprised--a lot of Indian people are really negative toward non-Indians. They blame non-Indians for things that happened hundreds of years ago. I always thought other Native Americans had the same views I did . . . . People who've never lived on a reservation are telling me what a reservation is like, and I grew up there. I call them 'book Indians'; they get their point of view from books; they don't know what reservations are like."

Here the issue of control over external boundary definition transforms into an explicit recognition of internal differentiation, with a linkage asserted between inter-group attitudes and demographic/cultural antecedents

("res" vs. city or suburb) and a conscious attempt to distance oneself from confrontationist, boundary-drawing.

Like the respondent quoted above, Indians who emphasized differences in inter-ethnic relations and attitudes tried to link them with other ways in which Indian people differed from one another, about which they claimed to have learned more in the course of the workshops. These dimensions of contrast (with varying definition and linkage) included: reservation/urban/suburban, degree of acculturation or assimilation, legal status ("treaty" and "non-treaty"), and regional and tribal heritage:

P4: "You come off the reservation for economic reasons and you encounter discrimination, then you think 'Why did I come off the reservation?' . . . I have trouble thinking like reservation people."

"Maybe because they (center city heritage staff) are urban, they face more discrimination than we do out here."

P2: "Western people are more belligerent . . . . I guess history is so much closer in their minds, since they're closer (to the fighting and stuff. They can trace, maybe they have a grandfather who was there then. For us, it's more distant--200 years ago."

Y1 "Out (west) they're not so prejudiced, . . . and they don't talk about . . . you know . . . violence in the community . . . . Here they're violent . . . and Indians are prejudiced too . . . . They learn to get mad or whatever because they're mistreated so much . . . learn to hate . . . a lot of the time."

H8: (with reference to how Indians react to stereotypes) "I don't know if it's anger--it's like reading about a foreign people . . . . The workshops reinforced that view because we had a variety of different Indian people there--from Washington State, the Southwest, the Midwest, the East. I was able to see there is a variety there . . . differences of beliefs and world view. . . . Out west, they talk about what they call the 'hang-around-the-fort Indians'. They don't have that here. I guess the closest is what they call 'urban Indians'. Me, I'm both. There's a difference here . . . . Depends on how you live--may be a treaty Indian, but no life style or heritage, even people on reservations. Then you have people in the cities

> with no legal connection, maybe they lost it through intermarriage. But in all respects they are traditional people . . . . Most of the heritage instructors avoided that issue . . . . A lot of it, they don't understand themselves. It's based on nationalism."

Preexisting offstage relationships within and between heritage programs --friendships, clientship, mediation, rivalries, and (most frequently cited) "jealousy"--were described by eight Indians as reappearing onstage to structure some workshop-related interactions; who sat with whom, who failed to share resources with whom. In turn, these offstage relationships were thrown into sharper relief and sometimes altered by what happened onstage. In two instances, each alluded to by a number of respondents, the phrasing of boundary definitions by assertive spokespersons in what some others perceived as overly "we/they" terms led to reassessments of their roles in their programs.

Teachers' responses showed that much of this variance among Indians had been registered, with particular awareness of differences in cultural adjustment and intergroup attitudes expressed by eight teachers. While teachers' perceptions of Indians thus moved toward increasing differentiation and realism, some considerable frustration was also expressed by four teachers, who complained that disagreements between Indian participants were sending them confusingly mixed messages:

> W2: "What should the Indian community do?"
>
> C13: "Get unified! 'Let's get into agreement, let's decide.' At one point, I asked if tribal ceremonies were related or parallel with the Masonic order, secretive (not open to non-Indians). I was told 'yes' by one person; another disagreed. How can I teach the kids? They (Indians) have to agree on how far we can go."

The same teacher characterized what had happened to intergroup relations in the course of the workshops with hand gestures;

C13: "People came and sat down, here and here (hands parallel, short distance apart). By the end, they were here (hands parallel, wide apart) or here (hands parallel, together). We did and we didn't (get together)."

Perceptions of convergence. While this graphic representation of polarization as well as convergence may well accurately describe the range of workshop dynamics, interview responses provide striking support for the proposition, developed in the analysis of the observational record, that on the whole participants were moving toward some convergence or at least mutual understanding of perceived interests.

Respondents expressed significant agreement across ethnic and professional status boundaries that in the course of the workshop series people had changed, in their demeanor and in their relations with one another. That these perceptions had high salience for respondents is indicated by the frequency with which they were volunteered (by 13 of 19) when responses to the workshops in general were elicited by openended questioning. Most respondents used generalizing language ("people"), implying that all participants had changed; where more explicit reference was made, persons unlike them in status were most often singled out.

Almost all respondents reported noticing increasing openness in intergroup communication, as expressed in the quality of discussion informal task groups and/or in the frequency of informal, participant-initiated interactions. Twenty-three (5C, 3S, 10H, 4P, 1Y) described the changes in affective and positive language:

P3: "More relaxed . . . a big change toward the end, we all got to know each other so much that we felt bad about ending."

There was more variance in attributions of agency or responsibility for

changes in participants. Six Indian respondents, all describing changes in positive terms, thought that increased trust and friendliness followed naturally from informal, inter-personal contacts, while three teachers and two Indians, also positive in their evaluation of changes, attributed them to engineering by workshop staff through program design. Other responses, including those recognizing some negative or polarizing effects, made more complex attributions: staff design modifications responsive to participant feedback, or increasing awareness of self and others as a result of interactions in workshop activities.

The role of workshop design had also implicit recognition in responses to questions about workshop procedures. A number of dimensions of contrast in procedures were recognized, with the most frequent mention given to contrasts in grouping procedures that directly affected participant alignments and interactions. These included: homogeneous/heterogeneous grouping, formal assignment/informal self-selection, and group size (assembly as one large group/division into small task groups). In general, heterogeneous groupings that were informal and/or simple in recruitment and task evoked positive responses. Two teachers and three Indians found the complex alignments and instructions of the Jigsaws "too confusing," but one heritage instructor (H5) approvingly remarked that "you made us work with different people, and we learned more that way." Homogeneous groupings had high negative mention, reflecting back on the "we/they" oppositionary arrangements of Workshop I as well as the Fishbowls. But one heritage instructor (H9) was impressed with how much convergence of interests had been initially achieved by matching teachers' questions with Indians' answers.

Changes as a result of the workshops were addressed most explicitly in the second question cluster, "What changes have you noticed . . .?" Only 14 respondents were presented with this question in initial, openended form. All but one of them chose to phrase their response to refer to relations with other workshop participants in a variety of contexts, inside and outside of the workshops.

When elicited follow-ups regarding contacts with workshop participants and responses to the question "Did you spend time during meals and coffee breaks with people like yourself?" were aggregated with these initial responses, no less than 28 respondents reported contacts during workshop meetings with other participants, with a total of 12 teachers, 8 heritage staff, 4 student teachers and all 4 parents identified (or identifying themselves) as involved in these encounters. Twenty-seven encounters across ethnic and professional status boundaries, twenty initiated by teachers and seven (during coffee or lunch time) initiated by Indians, were reported. Only two participants (1H, 1P) denied any informal intergroup contacts. Initiatives during free time were generally described in positive terms:

> P3: "I tried to sit with the teachers. (Otherwise) what was the point of it? I tried to get to know them better. How (else) can you share things? It'd be easy to just sit in your own little group."

But another Indian participant described teacher initiatives in more negative terms:

> H3: "Couple of times teachers came over and sat . . . . Wanted to ask more questions . . . keep probing . . . . (We) Indians just wanted to eat."

Then these reports of onstage interactions are set against the observational record, a disparity is immediately apparent. Respondents were

retrospectively describing more frequent and generally more affable interactions with a wider range of persons than had in fact been observed, and they appeared to be projecting these interactions back to a point earlier in the workshop series than observers had recorded. This discrepancy is interesting, and may represent a "recency effect" as well as indicating something about the extent to which most participants, Indians and non-Indians alike, had come to present themselves as having common stakes in the workshops' success.

Twenty-two instances of formal or informal contact, or changes in pre-existing relationships, outside of the workshops were also reported. These were most often teacher-initiated interactions with Native Americans (involving a total of 12 teachers, 6 heritage staff, 3 parents and both PAC members). The single most frequent reason (and/or result) reported for these interactions was informational exchange, teachers seeking advice on instructional content or general information about Native Americans, or seeking to widen communication with the parent(s) of a child in their classroom.

Members of three Native American families whose children were enrolled in classrooms with participating teachers also reported increasing contact and communication with those teachers and heightened teacher response to the child and his/her background. In one such case, both parent and teacher independently reported seeing marked positive changes in the child as a result. In a second case (where increased teacher/parent contact was initiated through recruitment of the parent, a heritage staff person in the City program, for classroom presentations), positive effects were also reported but less strongly. Parents of a third child registered some concern that "zeroing in" on the child had not been beneficial; interestingly, interviews conducted with the child's classmates

in Spring 1981 indicated that the child's ethnic heritage was not generally recognized by other children.

The participating Native American youth were secondary students whose current teachers were not workshop participants. Two of the three youth reported increased ethnic awareness and self-confidence in relations with teachers at this juncture; the third also reported this in response to a later question.

In responding to questions about work (other than work-related relations with participating Native American families) nine teachers and four heritage staff members reported positive effects in added skills and/or awareness and confidence in instruction but two teachers reported increased uncertainty, even anxiety, as regards what to teach. Three heritage staff members referred to benefits for their program through instructional methods learned, in one case by direct dissemination from a participating teacher.

While most changes (and most contacts, within and outside of the program) were described in positive terms, increased friction within heritage programs was reported by three City staff members and one suburban parent, centering on issues of ethnic boundary-definition and styles of inter-group communication that had surfaced in workshop encounters (see V.A., observations on Workshop IV). A report of continuing initiatives that impacted on the school and community context, based on ethnographic observation and participant reports, appears in Appendix B. It is taken from the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program final report, submitted on January 31, 1982.

These offstage initiatives support the thrust of the analysis of onstage interactions: that some very complex processes of boundary definition,

differentiation and convergence were set in motion by the workshop dynamics. Although the principal goal of the workshop design had been to increase inter-group understanding, the data show that there had been an effect on intra-group and self-perceptions as well. In the negotiation of Indian role identities from an encapsulated ethnicity without formal recognition or value in the larger community context to one of high salience and value in inter-group exchanges on the workshop stage, people were changed. One student of marginally Indian descent who recruited herself for the workshops in search of her own ethnic heritage described her experience with two kinds of Indian role models:

> S2: "Prouder . . . a sense of belonging . . . . Especially (H1); I was fascinated by her. She had known nothing about her heritage, and look at her now! With more time, I want to pursue my ancestry. . . . I'd had like a fantasized identity . . . strong sense of . . . not inner being, but a strong individual, character in almost all respects. I believed they were all very strong, very nature-oriented. (N3) was the perfect image of what was then and what is now. If I could ever be a true Indian, I would like to model myself like that--my identity."

One young heritage staff member who had been only marginally active in the Title IVA program as a student in the suburban district put it this way:

> H12: "I learned a great deal about my Indian heritage--and a lot about what goes on in schools. I never realized--when I went to school it didn't seem as if anyone was prejudiced, but since the job and the workshops I've noticed a lot of . . . don't know if I should call it prejudice; (pause) yeah, guess you can. I'm more aware now, more proud of my Indian heritage. Before, I thought I was just another person . . . didn't feel differently. Now I feel <u>special</u> because of my heritage. I think I've got a great heritage. Very proud of it, wish I knew more about it. I could teach my daughter, that's the age to start. We could sit around the fire telling stories."

For these two young women the workshops were like "sitting around the fire, telling stories": an encounter with their own ethnicity that transformed their sense of themselves.

V

Conclusions

This investigation has chronicled some of the ways in which Indian participants in an Ethnic Heritage Studies Program negotiated their "ethnic Indianness" through interactions with other workshop participants and events. As reported in their interview comments, a number of Indian participants began to view their ethnicity in different ways as a consequence of their workshop experiences. In their own words, they "broadened their learning about Indians," became "more aware" and "more proud of Indian heritage." They came to feel "not just another person" but "special because of my heritage." These expressions and others suggest heightened awareness of ethnic Indianness in the sense of both self identification and acceptance by others.

Group Processes

The naturalistic observations and interview responses reported in this investigation describe some of the processes through which heightened awareness were negotiated. During the course of workshop events, these processes were interwoven in complex interactions of participants and activities. They can be grouped into a number of clusters: initial role taking behaviors of participants, definition through cultural contacts, responsive restructuring of workshop activities, shifts toward role making behaviors, and the emergence of congruent attitudes and perceptions of participants.

One critical cluster of processes in the negotiation of identity was the initial role taking behaviors of participants. In assuming their educational roles as "teachers of teachers," Indian participants inverted "offstage" status

hierarchies where Indians sometimes assume "minority status" in contrast with White teachers. On the workshops' stage, teachers primarily asked questions and Indians suggested answers, sometimes very assertively (cf. Tajfel, 1982). The analysis of verbal interaction sequences and the description of seating patterns and informal dynamics strongly document these role taking behaviors. While many Indian participants noted some degree of reservation about assuming these roles in their interview responses, almost all participants recalled initial feelings of polarization. Teachers, especially, noted perceptions of themselves in the role of learners rather than in their role as teachers. While the majority of Indians also saw themselves as learners, those learning responses were primarily recorded in comments concerning newly acquired knowledge about traditional cultures as described in the presentations of tribal elders. All but three Indian participants stated clearly that they were there to help "teach teachers." Those shifts in status hierarchy were clearly evident in the initial workshop.

Another critical strand of processes in the negotiation of identity was definition of Indianness through cultural contrast. As suggested by one interview respondent, Indian people clarified their feelings about being Indian, not only through opportunities to define them themselves, but also "by virtue of having to say to the teachers who they were." From the very start of the workshops, Indian participants established control over statements of Indianness through formal and informal verbal comments and through emblematic cultural forms. As described in an earlier section, critical events in marking these cultural contrasts included the presentations of tribal elders in workshops II and III. Interview responses and comments made during workshop planning sessions

record numerous references to these presentations and to professed core values expressed in all workshops: spirituality, reverence for nature, familism, respect for cultural traditions.

Another cluster of critical processes was responsive restructuring of workshop activities. A general pattern of interaction between activity planning and responses of participants was documented in time reallocations in agendas. This general pattern was a change away from time originally allocated for developing instructional strategies and resources toward presentations by Indian speakers and open discussions. Critical activities in the workshops included interest groupings in Workshop I, Fishbowl activities in Workshops III and IV, the writing of home/school scenarios in Workshop IV, and Jigsaw cooperative team experiences in Workshops V and VI. In their interview responses, participants made far more references to the Fishbowls than to any other activity. While many of these references were negative, characterizing these events as "divisive" it may well be that the explicit groupings occurring during these events triggered a series of introspective and shared reflections and set the stage for the converging interests negotiated in the latter workshops aided, perhaps, by the cooperative learning Jigsaw technique.

Another cluster of critical processes in the negotiation of identity was shifting by some Indian participants toward role making behaviors and the recognition of differentiated identities by other Indians. As noted in observations and documented in the interview responses, some Indian participants readily assumed "spokesperson" roles. Other participants began to assert their individuality first privately and then publicly, that "we are not all the same," and that "they don't always speak for all of us." Dimensions of contrast began to

emerge among the once solidly "blocked group" of Indian participants. These dimensions of contrast included reservation/urban/suburban, degree of acculturation or assimilation, legal status ("treaty" and "non-treaty"), and regional and tribal heritage. These contrasts marked points of differentiation among Indian participants and served as markers for further introspection and clarification of ethnic Indianness by participants.

A final cluster of critical processes in the negotiation of identity was the emergence of congruent attitudes and perceptions among Indian and non-Indian participants. First observed in the two Jigsaw activities, this convergence was most dramatically observed in the potluck dinner of Workshop VI. As remembered in the interviews, this was a critical event on the workshop stage and may have served as a celebration of pluralistic values, i.e., the validity of ethnic differences and the recognition of mutual interests. All interviewed indicated a strong desire to continue workshop endeavors and to seek collaboration between the Indian community and school staff members in improving efforts to teach ethnic heritage. Continuing initiatives of participants in the cooperating school districts further document these ongoing endeavors.

The heightened awareness of ethnic Indianness expressed in this program was the result of complex clusters of interactions among participants and workshop events. Just as the structured activities of the workshop programs served as a catalyst to negotiations of identity by participants, offstage events in Indian communities and a wide range of interpersonal encounters also contributed to the observed changes in ethnic identities. This investigation has only chronicled a portion of those changes and some of the interacting processes. Further research in other such encounters should help to clarify and extend the

description of such processes.

Implications

The findings of this investigation suggest implications for other Ethnic Heritage Program endeavors and directions for further research.

Data gathered and analyzed in evaluating and researching the effects of this Ethnic Heritage Studies Program document its effectiveness in contributing to the increased communication and understanding between the Indian community and school. As reported in Appendix A, this took the form of (1) more sensitive classroom portrayals and analyses of Native American cultures by participating teachers and (2) continuing initiatives in ethnic heritage studies in the participating school communities. Critical factors in achieving these outcomes were:

1. the responsive structure of the workshop programs
   By carefully planning responsive evaluation procedures and by actively soliciting feedback from participants through the evaluation process, workshop directors constantly modified workshop plans in response to expressed concerns of stakeholders. This "formative evaluation" was a key factor in designing and modifying the workshops program.
2. the nature of activities as described in Section IV
   Through tasks such as the interest group discussions, Fishbowls, and Jigsaws, directors presented participants with opportunities to interact on an equal basis and explore their ethnic identities in varied situations.
3. open discussions

Responses to the needs of participants to have extended open discussion times permitted them to establish their own ground rules, to interact in different ways, and to raise questions and explore topics of concern to them. These negotiations of order contributed to the development of inter-group norms.

4. continued contact with participants

By continuing to work with participants beyond the time frame of the workshops themselves, directors reinforced continuing initiatives and encouraged ongoing pursuit of initiatives begun in the program. Strong support from the school district administration facilitated this reinforcement.

The convergence between groups and their continuing initiatives and expressions of "let's get together and share what we've been doing" points to the effectiveness of a design that takes account of a basic premise of contact theory. The responses of the participants reaffirm that "just putting people together doesn't work." Some careful engineering of the situation is indeed needed to override prevailing stereotypes, positive and negative, that impede communication and understanding between minority and majority groups. While it is not possible to disentangle the reciprocal interplay between workshop design and responsive evaluation methodology, it is clear that one model can complement another.

In reviewing the observational data and the interview protocols, it appears, however, that Allport's (1954) admonishment to maintain equal status between groups may not be possible in the short run. Witness the wresting of power by Indians in Session I. The data seem to suggest that even when inter-

ventions are consciously structured to equalize power, groups who have little power will attempt to assert their dominance. It also appears that unless the situation deliberately plans for task interdependence, and places all participants in "low threatening" non-competitive situations, such efforts may be resisted by the majority group (cf. Tajfel, 1982). In this context, responsive evaluation methods are promising in that they enable the minority viewpoint to be expressed in ways that members wish to express it, rather than having their needs interpreted for them by "knowledgeable" outsiders. The initiatives of power asserted by the Indians during the first and subsequent sessions (I-IV) could not have happened the way it did unless the directors were predisposed to respond to the concerns to participants. Alternatively neither could the "equalization" of status and the "cohesiveness" have taken place without the type of sustaining social interventions described in earlier sections.

Not until the united front displayed by Indians was accepted to their implicit satisfaction, did individuals within the group begin to explicitly verbalize their nonuniformity; "We are not all alike." "Speak for yourself." The emergence of these differentiations occurred during the afternoon of Workshop IV, where hitherto more silent members began to openly challenge the spokespersons. It is not clear how the first real evidence of open conflict aroused by the Fishbowl between Indians, teachers, and professionals ultimately was projected on the professionals. This unification of frustration of both groups seemed to develop a sense of "us against them." These perceptions were openly expressed and made legitimate by the final speaker of the afternoon. It appears that not until certain dynamics have been allowed to take place within a supportive environment that a resolution toward equal status becomes a

possibility. These conclusions are not situation-specific in that similar phenomena have been reported in the literature (cf. Tajfel, 1982; Reykowski, 1982).

The effectiveness of these two models, contact theory and responsive evaluation methods, in these workshops suggests that designers of similar programs consider these procedures in their planning.

Finally, the results of this investigation suggest a number of directions for future research. Exploring interactions within and between ethnic groups during the course of similar interventions may elaborate further dimensions of the "new ethnicity" (Bennett 1975) and the nature of ethnic boundary definition as described by Barth (1969) and others. Of particular interest would be a microanalytic investigation of the decision processes, including perceptions of congruence with the normative expectations of minority and majority audiences, involved in the selective presentation of self as Indian (or as a member of another minority group).

Although the focus of this investigation was on Indian ethnicity, it should be remembered that the events reported took place in the specific context of a jointly sponsored inservice program. Just as the behaviors displayed by Native Americans were in response to the particular group of non-Indians present (pre- and inservice teachers and directors), the teachers' behaviors were also responsive to a particular group of Indians and workshop staff. Inasmuch as these teachers were the principal target population of the workshop design, it would be useful to know whether their generally positive responses and compliance with the reversal of dominance would hold true for other groups of teachers, and with reference to other minority representatives. It should

be remembered that these teachers were self-selected. They may not be a representative sample of the teacher population at large.

The documentation of the number of continuing initiatives by inservice teachers suggests a need for a longitudinal study of the motivational and environmental elements that would help sustain efforts to teach values of cultural pluralism. Since teachers also engaged in similar processes of role taking and role making, it would be of interest to know how these processes mediated their responses and their attitudes towards Indians. Finally comparisons should be made between multi-cultural inservice programs that are self-contained, information dispensing ventures lacking participation from ethnic minorities, and programs that include bonafide representatives of those groups.

In conclusion, the effectiveness of a naturalistic responsive evaluation approach in providing a framework for data collection and evaluation of this program supports the efficacy of such naturalistic procedures for describing and analyzing complex educational endeavors. In the investigation, the combination of such procedures within a contact theoretic framework provided a means for exploring complex interactions that are often concealed and prove difficult to capture when using more quantitative procedures. The observation and interview methodology used to gather and analyze data in this investigation made it possible for researchers to adapt their procedures to complement the differentiated perceptions of participants about their interactions with events. This avoids the tensions that frequently accompany uniformity of treatment. Where efforts are being made to minimize group differences, the denial of individuality frequently results in conditions of depersonalization that can only exacerbate inter-groups differences.

References

Allport, G. W. The nature of prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Amir, Y. The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. Katz (Ed.), Towards the elimination of racism. New York: Pergamon, 1976.

Barth, F. Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of cultural difference. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co., 1969.

Bennett, J. A guide to the collection. In Bennett, J. (Ed.), The new ethnicity: Perspectives from ethnology. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co., 1975.

Blu, K. The lumbee problem: The making of an American Indian people. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Blumer, H. Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Brittan, A. Meanings and situations. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Bronfenbrenner, U. The ecology of human development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Cohen, E. The effects of desegregation on race relations. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 39, 271-299.

Cook, S. W. Motives in a conceptual analysis of attitude-related behavior. In W. J. Arnold & D. Levine (Eds.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 17) (Revised). Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.

DeVos, G., & Romanucci-Ross, L. Ethnicity: Vessel of meaning and emblem of contrast. In G. DeVos & L. Romanucci-Ross (Eds.), Ethnic identity: Cultural continuities and change. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1975.

Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959.

Goffman, E. Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.

Kimmel, D. C. Adulthood and aging (Rev. ed.). New York: Wiley, 1980.

McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. Identities and interactions. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Meltzer, B., & Petras, J. The Chicago and Iowa schools of symbolic interactionism. In B. Meltzer & J. Petras (Eds.), Symbolic interactionism: A reader in social psychology (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

Parkin, D. Exchanging words. In Kapferer, B. (Ed.). Transactions and meaning: Directions in the anthropology of exchange and symbolic behavior. Association of Social Anthropologists, Essays in Social Anthropology v. 1. Philadelphia: ISHI Press, 1976.

Pettigrew, T. Racially separate or together. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25(1), 43-68.

Pettigrew, T. Racial discrimination in the United States. New York: Harper, 1975.

Phillips, S. U. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In Cazden, C. (Ed.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1972.

Price, J. Native Studies: American and Canadian Indians. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, Ryerson Ltd., 1978.

Reykowski, J. Social motivation. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual review of psychology (Vol. 33). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1982.

St. John, N. School desegregation: Outcomes for children. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Schofield, J. W. Complementary and conflicting identities: Images and interaction in an interracial school. In S. R. Asher & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), Children's friendships in school settings. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Schofield, J. W. School desegregation and intergroup relations. In D. Bar-Tal & L. Saxer (Eds.), Social psychology of education, theory and research. New York: Wiley, 1978.

Schofield, J. W., & Sagar, H. A. Peer interaction patterns in an integrated middle school. Sociometry, 1977, 40, 130-138.

Sindell, P. Some discontinuities in the enculturation of Mistassini Cree children. In Spindler, G. D. (Ed.), Education and cultural process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Slavin, R. E. Using student team learning (Rev. ed.). Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, John Hopkins University, 1980.

Stake, R. Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co., 1975.

Spindler, G. D., & Spindler, L. Sociocultural and psychological processes in Menominee acculturation. University of California Publications in Culture and Society, No. 5., 1955.

Tajfel, H. Social psychology of intergroup relations. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual review of psychology (Vol. 33). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews Inc., 1982.

Stephen, W. G. School desegregation: An evaluation of predications made in Brown v Board of Education. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 217-238.

Wax, M. L. Indian Americans: Unity and diversity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Wax, M. L., Wax, R. H., & Dumont, R. Formal education in an American Indian community. Social Problems Monograph No. 1. Kalamazoo, MI: The Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1964.

Wolcott, H. A Kwakiutl village and school. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1967.

Wolcott, H. The teacher as an enemy. In Spindler, G. D. (Ed.), Education and cultural process. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

Wolf, R. L., & Tymitz, B. Ethnography and reading: Matching inquiry mode to process. Reading Research Quarterly, 1976-1977, 12, 5-11.

APPENDIX A

CONTINUING INITIATIVES OF STAKEHOLDERS

(from the Final Report of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program, January 1982)

Initiatives taken by workshop participants and others with stakes in the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program may be taken as behavioral indices of the attitudinal changes expressed in interview responses and as measures of the program's continuing impact on its institutional setting. In order to monitor these initiatives, investigators developed a plan for follow-up ethnographic observation of the suburban Title IVA Program, with which one of the workshop directors is now associated as consulting evaluator, and of three classrooms in one elementary school. Appendix S outlines the research design for the classroom observations, data from which is still in process of analysis. In addition, communication with other workshop participants was maintained and reports of all relevant initiatives and encounters recorded.

Initiatives varied by the status of the initiative-taker(s) and by the nature of the initiative taken. In the first instance, initiatives by Native American parents and heritage staff may be distinguished from each other and from those taken by classroom teachers, student teachers, suburban school district administrators, and by SUNY Geneseo workshop staff. In the second instance, it is useful to distinguish dissemination initiatives, in which information, resources or instructional approaches presented in the workshops were shared with non-participants, from other events that can be traced at least in part to the dynamics described in the analysis of the observational and interview data.

Teacher Initiatives.

Workshop credit projects resulted in direct dissemination when implemented in contexts external to the workshops. Of the 17 participating teachers, 14

developed teaching units using Native American or multicultural content, of which at least 8 had been implemented by December 1981. Three other teachers submitted reports on instructional strategies or resource evaluation, of which two had been implemented by December 1981. In a few cases, delays in unit development and/or in implementation may be attributable in part to the hesitancies (reduced agency) expressed in interview responses. Some teachers, however, reported their intention of delaying unit implementation until Spring 1982 in order to avoid the traditional classroom association of Native Americans with Thanksgiving, an association much criticized in the workshops by parents and heritage staff. Approaches to Native Americans soliciting informal evaluation of unit content have been reported.

Classroom observation in Fall 1981 focused on the implementation of one unit in a Kindergarten classroom linked to the workshops in several respects. The teacher, a workshop participant, had substantially revised an earlier Native American unit for workshop credit and taught it from 11/2 through 12/3 in two classes, morning and afternoon. The morning class included a Native American child, active in the suburban Title IVA Program, whose mother had participated as a parent in the workshops and whose father served on the Project Advisory Committee. This afforded the teacher an opportunity for using peer mentoring and parent involvement, teaching strategies she employs with other cultural units during the year, and provided an observational base for assessing program effects on the children who were the ultimate target of the program's design.

The teaching unit integrated Native American content with work on the full range of skills and content areas--reading readiness, numerical concepts,

motor, perceptual, social and affective awareness--targeted for development, through formal instruction, individual and group projects, and creative play (making use of a Native American playhouse in a simulated forest and garden setting). Worksheets, information materials and suggestions for family activities to reinforce classroom learning about Native Americans as well as practice in basic skills were regularly shared with parents, who were invited to participate in classroom activities as teacher aides and observers.

The informational content of the unit addressed negative and stereotypic attributions of Native Americans by giving emphasis to two dimensions of contrast in the Native American experience to which participating parents and heritage staff had drawn teachers' attention: the diversity of traditional cultures and changes from the traditional past to present-day cultural adjustments. In emphasizing these contrasts and in seeking to move children toward a more realistic and positive awareness of Native Americans, the teacher made systematic and effective use of Native American role models and mentors--heritage staff (in a presentation during a class field trip to the Title IVA Resource Room), the parents of the Native American child, and the child herself. Informal questioning of the child, her parents and her Title IVA class instructor revealed perceptions congruent with those of the observer and teacher, that the child's experience with the unit had been positive, leading to increased self-confidence as well as reinforcement of ethnic identity.

While not all participating teachers agree on the merits of peer mentoring, observational data and self-reporting by other teachers show other initiatives in identifying children of Native American descent, in sharp contrast with responses from District teachers to the Title IVA needs assessment survey

in March 1980. In at least two cases, teachers have contacted the parents of marginally Indian children in their classes to suggest that they consider enrolling their children in the Title IVA program. Participating teachers also contributed, directly or by stimulating interest among their colleagues, to a marked increase in requests for permission to bring classes to the Resource Room or for in-class presentations by the Title IVA Home-School Coordinator; 14 such requests were logged (and met) between 10/28/81 and 11/13/81, compared with 2 during the same period in 1980.

Building-level dissemination initiatives reported to investigators include: curriculum development (in one case involving the Kindergarten teacher described above and a non-participating 3rd grade teacher, plans for an integrated K-6 sequence on Native Americans), content area integration (in another school, initiated by two participating 2nd grade teachers in working with art and music teachers), and monitoring of presentations or displays with Native American content (for example, in still another school, two participating 6th grade teachers identified negative stereotyping in a school play, organized informational sessions for their colleagues with a Native American parent as resource person, and were able to bring about modifications in the production).

Less formally and/or directly, word-of-mouth communication between teachers, and between children impacted by teacher participation, appears to have stimulated considerable interest in Native Americans. In the school observed in Fall 1981, the investigator was not always able to separate the effects of this communication from the effects of her observation in the 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms, to which teachers and students alike seemed to be

responding.

One unobtrusive measure, the circulation of books on Native Americans in the school library, was utilized in order to find an independent measure of the impact of the program. Of 73 titles catalogued under 970.1 (North American Indians), 68 withdrawals were counted for 9/16 - 12/1/81, compared with 44 withdrawals during all of 1980. There was a sharp increase (1 to 13) in multiple circulations between Spring 1981 and Fall 1981. Titles on crafts, sign and picture language, and material culture continued to circulate more frequently than did titles on biography, general cultural or historical accounts, or picture books for young children. Thirty of the 68 withdrawals were by children in the 3rd grade classroom observed (leading the investigator to suspect that this measure was not wholly independent of her presence); nearly half (13) of these were by six children (of the 29 in the class) whose 2nd grade teacher had participated in the workshops.

Other teacher initiatives are apparent in their participation in district-wide committees addressing related concerns and/or affording opportunities for teachers to share information with others. The recruitment of teachers to the Title IVA Parent Committee is discussed below, as a Native American initiative. Four participating teachers served on the district's K-6 Multicultural Curriculum Committee, developing curriculum and instructional strategies for Black heritage studies. District administrators working with this committee describe the teachers, all from elementary schools, as repeatedly drawing on their workshop experience to suggest generalizable approaches.

These same administrators, who supported the original Ethnic Heritage Studies Program proposal in part with the expectation that it might serve as a

model for multicultural education in general, solicited the advice and assistance of workshop staff in planning and implementing an inservice program for all district teachers on 1/15/82. Workshop co-directors were asked to lead training sessions for teachers. Major coverage was given to the workshop series and the Title IVA program in a special issue on minority education of the district newsletter, to appear in 2/82; they were also described in an article published in the Social Science Record (V. XVIII, No. 3, 1981) by the district's Social Studies Coordinator. Communication between district administrators and the Title IVA program has increased, more active interest being shown in program activities and personnel matters; in part, this responds to the effects of workshop dynamics on the Native Americans themselves.

Student Teacher Initiatives.

Four of the six participating student teachers developed teaching units using Native American content. No implementation of units to date has been reported to program directors. Preservice teachers contributed to the dissemination process by conducting training sessions on strategies for multiethnic awareness with Native Americans as the exemplar group, for 50 peers at SUNY Geneseo in March 1981. Workshop materials were also disseminated among non-participating SUNY Geneseo student teachers in Fall 1981.

Native American Initiatives.

Dissemination initiatives included special projects developed by Native American staff and parents. Two parents developed guidelines for the evaluation of children's books which were shared with librarians in their respective elementary schools; one librarian, a workshop participant, used these guidelines in evaluating books on Native Americans in her library as her credit project, and groundwork was laid for presentations to other district librarians.

Two other parents developed a proposal for informational contacts with guidance counselors in the city and suburban school districts, and for the dissemination of materials on Native American scholarships and study programs; this has been incorporated into a projected on-site college visitation program for area Native American youth and preliminary contacts have been made with guidance counselors. Two staff members from the city programs conducted in-service workshops for city district teachers as their credit project; this led in turn to an invitation to one of the staff to present on Indian stereotypes before the city Association for the Education of Young Children. The same staff member reports a sharp increase in requests for formal and informal presentations to area educational and other organizations, attributing this in part to heightened awareness of Native Americans as resource persons for speaking programs.

City program staff and the project administrator likewise report direct workshop content input and increased self-confidence in staff presentations during a Native American Awareness Week at a city elementary school not previously served by the city program. Drawing in part on instructional strategies, curriculum guidelines, and inter-group communication skills acquired through the workshops, the city's Title VII (Mohawk Bilingual/Bicultural) Program is now applying for funding as a training center for Native American Language curriculum development, with assistance from one of the workshop co-directors.

Native American parents and staff from city and the suburb have participated in formal and informal dissemination at regional and national conferences. Informal communication about the workshops, highly positive in nature, was reported during Native American Research Institute technical assistance workshops,

for New York State Heritage Programs in May and October 1981. One staff participant attending a statewide in-service on Iroquois culture for secondary teachers asked for time to report on the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program as an exemplary model for teacher sensitization.

Two parents from the suburb and three staff members from the city heritage programs participated with the workshop co-directors in a major dissemination activity, presentation of a workshop "Linking Heritage Education with Classroom Instruction," at the 11th annual National Indian Education Association meeting in Portland, Oregon. Materials disseminated at the workshop and in follow-up mailings included resource evaluation guidelines and curriculum units developed by Native American participants, in addition to workshop materials and the training model, "Talking Together" developed for their utilization.

In part, as a result of interactions during the workshop series, personnel exchanges, accompanied initially by some discord, occurred between the city and suburban programs. One heritage instructor left the Title VII program to join the suburb's Title IVA staff; in turn, a suburban parent (now chairperson of the suburb's Parent Committee) assumed teaching as well as home-school liaison duties in the city program. Both programs have asked the workshop staff for assistance and information; one workshop co-director now serves as the suburban program's consulting evaluator and has also assisted the city Title VII program with writing the funding proposal described above.

The suburban program followed the workshops with two initiatives intended to maintain and widen the dialogue with district personnel. First, four participating teachers were nominated as candidates for membership on the program's Parent Committee; three were elected and one serves as alternate; of the three

selected, two have attended frequent meetings and made active contributions to committee deliberations. Secondly, an Open House for all interested teachers, students and administrative staff in the school district was held on September 24, in celebration of Native American Day. Fifty-four persons attended.

Increasingly frequent requests for presentations and for other informational services have been logged by the Title IVA Home-School Coordinator (see above). In part, this heightened visibility for the program and the growing demands on its limited staff time can be traced to the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program workshops. In conjunction with the differentiating effects of workshop dynamics on status definitions within the Native American community and, in particular, on the agency of participants, they have led to debate within the community itself, a debate centering on issues of program control as well as on the presentation of Indian identity.

It can be argued that the workshops afforded an arena or stage on which Native Americans debated, with each other as much as with non-Indians, how their identity should be asserted in contemporary society--specifically, whether in integrated multiethnic communities and indeed in multiethnic families, privately varying notions of what it means to be Indian can be given public expression in common core symbols to which all can ascribe. Prior to the workshops, Title IVA project staff had been the principal spokespersons for the program and its primary links with Indian organizations and activists elsewhere. The workshops brought to the surface for self-scrutiny and reflection the considerable range of cultural adjustments and relations with non-Indians among Native American participants, precisely because parents and staff were collectively assigned the initial (role-taking) task of "speaking for" all Native

Americans. As role-taking gave way to role-making, with increasing opportunity for personal exchanges with individual non-Indians, the groundwork was laid for increased parent agency in their own program as well as in relations with school personnel. The Parent Committee in fall 1981 was more active, and more divided in its sense of direction for the program, than in the past.

The complex interactions analyzable from the observational and interview data summarized in the preceding report suggest that contact theory can be usefully elaborated to take into account the effects of structured inter-group communications on perceptions of self (and of other like selves) as well as on perceptions of (different) others. Investigators intend to develop such elaborations, and to report more fully on research findings, in subsequent papers. A submission to the American Education Research Association has been accepted for the March 1982 annual meeting. In addition, a workshop proposal (on individual and group identity, with the teacher observed in fall 1981) has been submitted to the National Association for the Education of Young Children for the November 1982 meeting. What has been learned to date from the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program indicates that a responsive model of program development and evaluation generates data of great richness, and, in the process, contributes directly to program impact by increasing agency among participant stakeholders.